DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 256	EA 019 804
AUTHOR	Duttweiler, Patricia Cloud; Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE	Dimensions of Effective Leadership.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	87
CONTRACT	400-86-0008
NOTE	139p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, SEDL Office of Institutional Communications, 211 E. 7th Street, Austin, TX 78701 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Leadership Qualities; *Organizational Change; Organizational Theories; Research Utilization; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This volume provides a comprehensive synthesis of competencies that research has associated with the administration of effective schools. Following an introduction, section 1, "Re-thinking the Organizational Structure of Schools," presents current thinking on the organizational structure in which school administrators function. Alternative models are offered so that schools can redesign their environment to develop greater excellence. "Research on the Competencies of Effective Administrators," section 2, discusses the skills and competencies of effective administrators identified in some of the major research studies. Section 3, "Competencies of Effective Administrators," groups the competencies discussed in section 2, plus others found in the literature, under the eight categories defined in the U.S. Department of Education's Leadership in Educational Administration Program (LEAD). A ninth area, involving parents and the community in school improvement, is added to the discussion. "Providing Leadership for Change," section 4, recommends ways that individuals can incorporate the leadership functions into administering their school or school district to facilitate improvement. The final section of conclusions emphasizes that the bureaucratic structure of most schools is not conducive to educational excellence. Policymakers should include "leadership for change" as a competency needed to redesign school organizational structure. The report provides 11 pages of references and 4 appendices of identified administrative skills and competencies. (CJH)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED289256

Dimensions of Effective Leadership

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OERI Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

EA 019 804

SEDL

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Dimensions of Effective Leadership

Patricia Cloud Duttweiler

Shirley M. Hord

1987

SEDL
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Preston C. Kronkosky, Executive Director
211 East Seventh Street, Austin, Texas 78701 (512) 476-6861

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement OERI

DIMENSIONS OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

ERRATA

Page	
3	Line 2 -- "identific" should be "identified."
10	Second paragraph -- there should not be any space between lines 10 and 12.
13	Second paragraph, line 14 -- "carefully" should be hyphenated.
15	Second paragraph, line 3 -- there should be a space between the words "their strength."
53	Third line from the bottom -- "teachers's" should be "teacher's."
58	Second paragraph -- the sentence begun in line 5 should continue "relationships among staff members in the school (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983)."
61	Number 7, line 2 -- there should be a space between the words "as well."
88	Line 14 -- there should be a space between the text on lines 13 and 14; the text on line 16 should continue after "the" on line 15.
96	Concluding paragraph, line 1 -- "encompas" should be "encompass" ; line 7, there should be a space between the words "restructuring should."

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly, or in part, by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, under Contract Number 400-86-0008. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

Rationale 1

Organization of the Material 2

SECTION ONE: RE-THINKING THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF SCHOOLS 5

The Traditional Organizational Structure of Schools and Conditions That Dictate Change 5

The Bureaucratic Structure of Schools 6

Changes in Attitudes Toward Authority, Task Complexity, and in Staff Qualifications 7

Problems With Bureaucratic Management 8

Structuring Schools for Excellence 10

Organizing Principles 11

Implications for Policy Makers and Administrators 12

Alternative Models of School Organization 13

Professional Bureaucratic Model 13

Cooperative Professional Bureaucratic Model 14

School-Based Management 16

Diagnosing School Management 20

SECTION TWO: RESEARCH ON THE COMPETENCIES OF EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS 23

Identifying Skills and Competencies Related to Job Factors 23

Research on Competencies That Differentiate Effective Principals 28

Effective and Typical Principals 28

High Performing Principals 29

Effective vs. Ineffective Principal Behavior 30

Instructional Leadership Behaviors of Effective Principals 34

Problem-Solving Strategies of Effective Principals 35

Personal Qualities of Effective Principals 39

SECTION THREE: COMPETENCIES OF EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS 43

Categories of Skill Areas 43

Creating and Enhancing Environments for Learning 44

Evaluating Curricula to Improve Effectiveness 47

Analyzing Instruction and Teacher Performance 48

Appraising Student Performance/School Performance 51

Understanding/Applying Research Outcomes 53

Organizing/Managing School Resources 53

Ensuring Discipline and School Order 56

Developing Human Relations Skills 58

Involving Parents and the Community 60

SECTION FOUR: PROVIDING LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE 65

Leadership: A Prerequisite for Effectiveness 65

Definitions of the Terms "Manager" and "Leader" 65

Instructional Leadership Revisited 67

Time Constraints and Instructional Leadership 68

Complexity of Role 69

Principals' Perceptions of Their Roles 70

Providing School Leadership 71

Facilitating the Functions of School Leadership 72

Involving Others in Decision Making and Problem Solving 74

Problems in Developing Shared Leadership 75

Developing the Capacities of School Staff to Participate in Leadership Teams 78

Behaviors of Principals that Support Change 80

Principal's Role in Change 80

Patterns of Principal's Facilitating Behavior 81

Categories of Facilitation Actions 83

Types of Principal Interaction With Staff 84

Characteristics of the Three Styles 86

Summary of Change-Facilitating Principal Behaviors 87

SECTION FIVE: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 91

REFERENCES 97

APPENDIX A 109

American Association of School Administrators
Skills for Successful School Leaders

APPENDIX B 115

Florida Council on Educational Management
Definitions and Behavioral Indicators

APPENDIX C 127

Center for Educational Policy and Management
Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of Secondary School Principals
Linked With School Effectiveness

APPENDIX D 133

Indicators of Change Facilitator Style

Dimensions of Effective Leadership

Introduction

This volume provides a comprehensive synthesis of competencies associated with the administration of effective schools. It emphasizes that the bureaucratic structure found in most schools today is not conducive to educational excellence. And it suggests that *leadership for change* is an inclusive competency that should be fostered by educational policy makers through a redesign of the organizational structure of schools.

Rationale

By 1983, education had become a major focus of concern across the nation and the top priority in most states' legislatures. Since then, more than 300 state commissions and many more local groups have pushed for a new agenda for education. Legislated reforms designed to raise the quality of public school education have included curriculum revision, student basic-skills competency testing, increased high-school graduation standards, and lower student/teacher ratios. Legislation has also been directed toward teacher competency. Reforms designed to improve the quality of teachers and classroom instruction have included testing graduates of teacher-training programs, evaluating beginning teachers for certification and career teachers for accountability, and initiating career-ladder and merit-pay plans. Most recently, state legislatures have considered a number of reforms directed at improving school administrators.

The findings of the effective schools research have generated reforms directed at school administrators. Five factors have consistently been identified by researchers as characteristics of effective schools — strong administrative leadership, a school climate conducive to learning, a school-wide emphasis on instruction, high teacher expectations for student achievement, and systematic monitoring of pupil performance. These are either directly or indirectly related to the effectiveness of principals (Fullan, 1982; Manasse, 1985; Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979; Venezky & Winfield, 1979). Despite the lack of a comprehensive definition for principal effectiveness, researchers agree that certain principals are effective. Not only do students in their schools perform well academically, but also members of their communities also feel a common sense of purpose and have a positive attitude about what is occurring in their schools (Manasse, 1985).

While many administrators perform effectively within the current organizational structure of the public schools, there is an amazing degree of agreement within the educational research community that this structure does not promote excellence in teaching or learning -- that effective administrators achieve excellence in spite of, not because of, the bureaucratic structure of the schools. The consensus among those who have studied the problem is that new policies should be implemented that promote a restructuring of the schools to an organizational model more appropriate for knowledge-work professionals.

Organization of the Material

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education has instituted a Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) program that enables states to establish Leadership Centers for training school administrators to function more effectively. Identifying the ideal target behaviors before undertaking such a behavioral-change effort seems advisable; therefore, the major purpose of this publication is to delineate those competencies that research has associated with the effective administration of public schools. This is done in Sections Two, Three, and Four. The assumption of the LEAD program is that once skills and competencies of effective school administrators have been identified, administrators can be evaluated on how closely they match the ideal, and professional growth opportunities can be provided to develop or improve their competencies. The organizational structure of the schools will determine which of those competencies should be developed.

Section One

To focus the reader's thinking on what type of organization is most conducive to school effectiveness, the opening section presents current thinking on the organizational structure in which school administrators are expected to function. It also offers alternative models of school organization through which the schools can be redesigned to create an environment in which administrators, teachers, and students can strive for excellence.

Section Two

There is a considerable amount of research literature on the competencies and skills necessary for performing effectively as a school administrator -- so much, in fact, that confusion sets in. This section is an attempt to provide order to the confusion by discussing some of the major research studies and the skills and competencies of effective administrators identifie in them.

Section Three

The skills and competencies identified in Section Two, plus others found in the literature, are grouped under the categories defined in the U.S. Department of Education's Leadership in Educational Administration Development Program (LEAD). The LEAD program specified eight skill areas as a focus for planning training programs to develop the competencies needed by effective school administrators. The eight skill areas include: creating and enhancing school environments for learning and student achievement, evaluating school curricula to assess and improve effectiveness, analyzing instruction and teacher performance, appraising and assessing student performance and other indicators of school performance, understanding and applying research outcomes to school improvement, organizing and managing school resources, ensuring student discipline and a climate of order, and developing human resources. A ninth area, involving parents and the community in school improvement, has been added to the discussion.

Section Four

This section examines the superordinate characteristic called leadership in an attempt to reach some conclusions about how individuals who are seeking both effectiveness and excellence can incorporate the functions of leadership into running their schools or school districts. In addition, the point made in this section is that leadership functions work best for school improvement when they are shared with school staff within an organizational structure that provides the authority to carry out responsibilities with creativity and flexibility.

Section Five

This section is a summary and conclusion for the preceding sections.

Section One
Re-Thinking the Organizational Structure of Schools

Federal, state, and local school improvement initiatives are placing greater emphasis on improving the competencies of administrators. This section discusses the problems inherent in the bureaucratic structure under which most schools are operating. It suggests that the skills and competencies considered desirable and worthy of development in the school administrator will depend on the organizational structure in which the administrator must function. In addition, it provides a basis for the argument that school administrators should not continue to be trained to manage school systems as they are currently structured, but should be trained to be leaders in re-structured systems.

In order to focus the reader's thinking on what type of school organization is most conducive to school effectiveness, this opening section discusses the current thinking on the organizational structure of public schools in the United States.

The Traditional Organizational Structure of Schools and Conditions That Dictate Change

Policy makers hesitate to ask questions about the effectiveness of the organizational structure of schools because the answers are complex and do not lend themselves to quick fixes (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). Yet, the educational reform movement will not fulfill the high hopes of its supporters as long as reform strategies fail to mesh with the requirements of organizational restructuring (Guthrie, 1986). The consensus among those who have studied the problem is that new policies should be implemented that promote an organizational model of school more appropriate for knowledge-work professionals.

Such diverse groups as the National Governors' Association, the Holmes Group, and the National Commission on Excellence in Educational

Administration agree that the current organizational structure of the schools does not promote excellence in teaching or learning. With this concern uppermost in mind, the Holmes Group, a consortium of 94 research universities, focused its attention on what should be done to remodel the public schools (Education Daily, 1987, Feb. 3). Speakers at a recent meeting of the Group pointed out that the organizational structure of schools renders most attempted changes superficial, ineffective, or temporary. Chairwoman Judith Lanier, dean of Michigan State University's College of Education, challenged, "The old ways have to change." The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987) emphasized that a revolution in the way schools are organized is needed.

The Bureaucratic Structure of Schools

The concept of a school system suggests there should be some unifying quality among the schools that are a part of that system. Bureaucratic structures have traditionally met the school system's need for this unifying quality. Most schools operate under what is usually referred to as the bureaucratic model (often called the factory model). Bureaucratic organization has provided mechanisms by which the system regulates the activities of teachers and other school professionals and limits and controls the amount of discretion those individuals exercise (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). According to Firestone and Wilson (1985), bureaucratic linkages -- such as the roles, rules, procedures, and authority relations -- serve to coordinate the activity of the people who work in schools.

The bureaucratic model requires clear lines of authority; rules formulated by superiors to govern subordinates; and centralized evaluation, planning, and decision making (Bacharach & Conley, (1986). Most school administrators have been trained to manage such tightly coupled, bureaucratic systems -- systems that are characterized by (1) rules, (2) agreement on what those rules are, (3) a system of inspection to see whether compliance occurs, and (4) feedback designed to improve compliance (Weick, 1982). However, schools typically are loosely coupled in most areas and missing one or more of the characteristics of tightly coupled systems (Weick, 1982). A loosely coupled system is more elusive, less tangible, harder to grasp, harder to administer, and requires a different set of perceptions and behaviors than does a tightly coupled, bureaucratic system (Weick, 1982).

The theories of management on which the bureaucratic structure of most schools are based contain core assumptions that do not apply to loosely coupled systems and, therefore, require heroic efforts of administrators.

These assumptions assign administrators the sole burden of responsibility. It is the administrator who must parcel out the work, set the objectives, monitor the performance, see that work is done, and fix whatever is wrong. Even though these administrators may solicit subordinate input and delegate important tasks, the underlying assumption is that good administrators are the only ones who are able to see the overall view of what the school should be doing and the only ones who should have the responsibility for seeing that success is obtained (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

Schools organized on the bureaucratic model tend to overemphasize specialization of tasks, routine operating rules, and formal procedures in organizing for teaching and learning. They are characterized by a proliferation of regulations, formal communications, centralized decision making, and sharp distinctions between administrators and teachers and between teachers and students (Sergiovanni, 1987b). Standard operating procedures are emphasized for teachers; standardized outcomes are established for students. As Sergiovanni (1987b, p. 319) has succinctly phrased it, "within bureaucracies, principals and teachers are expected to behave like bureaucrats rather than like professionals."

Changes in Staff Qualifications,Task Complexity, and Attitudes Toward Authority

Changes have taken place in recent years in staff qualifications, task complexity, and in attitudes toward authority that are making the bureaucratic nature of schools untenable. According to Feistritzer (1986, p. 1)), "the teaching profession is attracting a new wave of older and brighter people than it traditionally has in the past." The data show, for example, that 60% of teachers with less than five years of experience graduated from college with honors. In addition, the average age of those entering teaching over the past five years is higher (26.5 years of age) than of people who entered the profession 15 or more years ago (22.5 years of age). A recent American Federation of Teachers survey of state officials found that, among the 28 states responding, 51% of the teachers hired in 1985-86 were re-entering the profession (cited by Feistritzer, 1986).

In addition, task complexity virtually insures that no one person can have all the knowledge necessary to carry out numerous complex tasks. In previous decades, it was possible for leaders to understand, and often to execute, all school tasks better than their subordinates. Compared to the administrator, teachers had a minimal education, which guaranteed a significant expertise gap (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). In today's schools, however, many of those evaluated by the principal know more about their own work than does the principal. Teachers and other school staff are usually as well-educated as administrators. Principals, by virtue of the office they occupy, have position power. However, by virtue of personal expertise and hands-on experience, those they manage often understand better what is needed to assure the maximum productivity of their students (Schlechty & Joslin, 1986).

Changing attitudes toward authority are causing what has been described in the management literature as a loss or erosion of authority (Heller, 1985). Authority is defined as *shared belief* about the power or influence of an organization or an individual representing that organization. Authority is vested in an individual or an organization by the members who share those beliefs (Blumer, 1969). For example, Duke (1986) contends that the behavior of a leader does not constitute leadership until it is perceived as such by an observer. The effectiveness of a leader lies in his or her ability to make activity meaningful for others — to help others understand what they are doing and to help them communicate to others the meaning of their behavior.

Today's manager is expected to give meaning to work by being someone *worth working for* rather than by being someone performing an organizational role. The contemporary worker appears to be disillusioned with bureaucratic managers and no longer automatically assigns them power. A 20-year study of management trainees at AT&T summed up the loss of willingness to submit to authority and be bossed as an attitude of "the hierarchy be damned" (Howard & Bray, 1981). Another 20-year study of business school students describes results that clearly indicate a decline in "positive attitudes toward authority" (Miner & Smith, 1981). These analyses indicate that the boss has lost a measure of the authority that previously came automatically with the role (Heller, 1985). The proliferation of teacher demands to be included in the decision-making processes within schools indicates that this may also be happening in the public-school sector. The combination of an older, brighter teaching force and a general societal decline in accepting position authority increases the need to examine the problems that are created by bureaucratic management structures.

Problems With Bureaucratic Management

What happens when modern, complex organizations are managed with a traditional bureaucratic style?

First, information often does not flow freely and easily to the right places (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). In loosely coupled systems, relationships among people are unpredictable, weak, and intermittent; knowledge of effects is affected by the delays and inaccuracies that occur in such systems; and most actions have an immediate effect on only a small number of the activities and people in the organization. Since diffusion is slow and erratic, any single policy initiative may lose momentum (Weick, 1982). Problems are noticed down the line in such an organization, but rarely identified, because subordinates do not feel responsible for identifying difficulties. When information finally does work its way up, it is likely to be distorted and filtered by its transmission through many people, each with a different vested interest in interpreting the situation their way (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

A second problem is the lowered quality of decisions. Not only are problems hidden until they become major, but important information is frequently withheld. Furthermore, the administrator who maintains bureaucratic control tends to restrict the possible solutions and approaches to those he or she feels competent in using (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). Such leadership, valid when the superior was more knowledgeable than subordinates, does not fully use the technical abilities and problem-solving skills of present-day school personnel. This leads to a third problem, traditional managers who shoulder the responsibility for coordinating all activities decrease the responsibility felt by subordinates for the success or failure of any effort. The frustrating part of this situation for the administrator is that greater effort exacerbates the problem. While increasingly heroic efforts are demanded of the administrator, the abilities of school staff are ignored, resulting in lowered motivation throughout the school (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

As Barth explains (1987), within the bureaucratic model many administrators attempt to exercise an authoritarian, hierarchical kind of leadership: they arrange schedules and control behavior; maintain tight personal control over money and supplies; and dictate curriculum, goals, and means. While this type of behavior results in a certain amount of order, productivity, and consonance, it creates a dependent relationship between the administrator and school staff and practically eliminates flexibility and creativity. Staff are immobilized and afraid to move without orders (Barth, 1987). This is the opposite of the kind of behavior exhibited by effective administrators. Roueche and Baker (1986, p. 15) found that effective administrators "are flexible in their approach to leadership and use an appropriate type of control for professionals who have specialized expertise in various areas. They encourage innovation and at the same time tolerate failure."

It has been suggested that one of the greatest dangers of the effective schools literature is its potential to reinforce the existing tendency for schools to become more bureaucratic, providing precise recipes for every principal and teacher to follow (Schlechty, 1985). The underlying structure of the bureaucratic model often limits the effectiveness of good principals, but what is worse, has a tendency to produce principals who subscribe to those bureaucratic values and procedures that actually obstruct teaching (Seeley, 1985).

The fact that the education profession is attracting older and brighter individuals and that authority patterns appear to be changing suggests a redefinition of school management toward something different from the hierarchical arrangements of the past. Testimony before the California Commission on the Teaching Profession (Commons, 1985, p. 35) indicated that "old fashioned bureaucracy is poorly suited for the management of trained professionals." The kinds of management and organizational styles that are appropriate for motivating, instructing, and evaluating persons who manipulate symbols and manage people is fundamentally different from the organizational forms appropriate for dealing with persons who manipulate and produce physical objects (Schlechty & Joslin, 1986). The Commission concluded that teachers must participate in the task of managing and reforming their schools (Commons, 1985).

Structuring Schools for Excellence

"Form should follow function" is a principle of organization learned early in administrator preparation programs. The corollary to this principle is foreboding. "If form does not follow function, function will be modified and shaped to fit the form" (Sergiovanni, 1987b). The point of this principle is that schools should be deliberately organized and structured with purposes in mind and in ways that facilitate those purposes. Frequently the structures that determine what goes on in schools and how it is accomplished emerge from habit, tradition, or political pressures (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

While bureaucratic mandates and minimum standards may raise the floor and guarantee a higher level of mediocrity, bureaucracies do not promote excellence (Schlechty, 1985). If educational reform efforts are to improve teaching and learning, policy makers must develop a clear image of where they want to go. Ubben and Hughes (1987) point out that healthy organizations engage in systematic analyses of organizational activities. These effective organizations regularly ask, "Why are we doing what we are doing; what are we doing; and can it be done in a better way?" In order to guide educational reform, policy makers must visualize and articulate the outcomes their systems should strive to achieve, then see that those systems are designed to enable people to choose actions that have the best chance of accomplishing the goals and achieving the outcomes (Ingram, 1986). Both the effective schools literature and the literature on America's best run businesses verify the adage, "people who know where they're going are more likely to get there" (Schlechty, 1985).

Organizing Principles

Organizing for excellence requires that policy makers reach beyond bureaucracy and seek those organizational features that enhance teaching and learning. Organizing for excellence means providing the administrative structures, arrangements, and coordinating mechanisms needed to propel teaching and learning toward a maximum level (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

For those who seek excellence in their schools, the following principles, synthesized from Sergiovanni (1987b), should guide decisions as school structures are developed:

The principle of cooperation. Cooperative arrangements facilitate teaching and enhance learning.

The principle of empowerment. Feelings of empowerment contribute to ownership and increase commitment and motivation to work.

The principle of responsibility. Responsibility upgrades the importance and significance of work and provides a basis for recognition of success.

The principle of accountability. In successful schools, organizational structures allow staff to be accountable for their decisions and achievements.

The principle of meaningfulness. When jobs are perceived as meaningful, they not only take on a special significance but also provide feelings of intrinsic satisfaction.

The principle of ability-authority. In successful schools, organizational structures promote authority based on ability.

Developing school structures that encompass the principles described above requires that policy makers and school administrators look beyond bureaucratic constraints in search of creative new insights and ideas. Contemporary organizational theorists have found that distinctions between effective and less effective organizations are usually based on how organizations treat the people who work in them. In knowledge-work endeavors such as teaching and schooling, the technical and managerial aspects should always be subordinate to human needs and actions, and should always be practiced to serve human ends (Sergiovanni, 1987b). The effective schools research indicates, for example, that schools which engage teachers in job-related discussions and have teachers share in decisions about instructional programs are more effective than schools in which decisions are made by rule-bound, bureaucratic procedures (Burden, 1985).

Implications for Policy Makers and Administrators

What are the implications for policy makers and administrators? Is less *management* better *leadership* ? Subordinates obviously need challenging tasks and the autonomy to carry them out, but they also, at various times, need support, coaching, and assistance. Part of that assistance involves helping staff coordinate their efforts with others. Although competent subordinates will usually want and need a certain degree of autonomy, there will be times when they want information, advice, a sounding board, encouragement, support from supervisors, or aid in collegial interaction with peers. Even rules and procedures are seen as necessary when appropriately developed, because they provide methods for coordinating work and resolving disputes (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

The objective of restructuring the schools is not to give up those bureaucratic features that serve a coordinating function, but to avoid bureaucratic abuses (Sergiovanni, 1987b). For example, a reasonable amount of stability must exist in the ways in which schools are organized and operated. Routines can help schools in accomplishing less important aspects of schooling in an efficient manner. School rules and regulations reduce ambiguity and ensure equitable treatment of people. Excellence requires budget and control systems; formalized ways to appraise, reward, and promote; long-range planning and forecasting systems; and division of labor and job descriptions (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). Certainly, these benefits of bureaucratic features should be incorporated in school organization design. The dilemma for the administrator, then, is not whether control needs to be exercised, but how to exercise it in such a way as to empower others and tap their expertise, energy, and enthusiasm.

The basic message in the research literature is that effective schools are characterized by energetic and committed people sitting down together, looking at problems, and figuring out ways to solve them (Schlechty, 1985). In order to get committed people to sit down together to solve problems, superintendents and board members must establish policies that: (1) foster development of clear goals in each school building, (2) encourage faculties and building administrators to translate these goals into measurable results, (3) encourage teachers and administrators to use their own initiative and imagination to solve problems, (4) recognize that problems and conflict are a normal part of organizational life rather than a pathological condition to be avoided, and (5) foster a long-term developmental view without restricting the organization's ability to respond to the need for immediate action (Schlechty, 1985). As a first step toward developing such policies, it is important for school boards and top-level administrators to examine carefully the image they hold of schools and the purposes of schooling. They must constantly seek the answers to the question, "What is our school system about — what are its binding goals and commitments (Schlechty, 1985)?"

Some of the alternative organizational structures suggested to replace the Bureaucratic Model are the Professional Bureaucratic Model, the Cooperative Bureaucratic Model, and the School-Based Management Model. The next section will discuss these models.

Alternative Models of School Organization

Professional Bureaucratic Model

Professionals and bureaucrats perform their work differently. The work of bureaucrats is circumscribed and dictated for them by the system of which they are a part. On the other hand, professionals are assumed to command a body of knowledge enabling them to make informed judgments in response to unique situations. The work of professionals develops from an interaction between their knowledge and client needs. A central tenet of professionalism is that sufficient degrees of freedom exist so that professionals are able to use informed judgments in the course of their practice (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

Many experts recommend re-shaping the schools using a professional bureaucratic model in which certain management-support systems would be conducted bureaucratically but professionals would have a high degree of autonomy in pursuing their activities. This is often referred to as the *medical model.* Teaching and learning would be under the control of highly trained professionals who, free of restrictions, would diagnose educational problems and prescribe educational treatments to their students (Sergiovanni, 1987b). Within schools organized as professional bureaucracies, control and coordination would be achieved by relying on standardized skills and standardized diagnostic abilities of teachers. Teachers would be expected to master a set of standard teaching repertoires, possess certain standard teaching competencies, and learn standard diagnostic procedures. Under these conditions, teachers, like physicians, should be able to reliably diagnose student educational problems, decide on treatments, and provide these treatments in standardized ways (Sergiovanni, 1987b). The professional bureaucratic model addresses the teachers' needs for discretion in planning, organizing, and conducting their work and emphasizes the autonomy of teachers in identifying student needs and developing appropriate responses to those needs (Bacharach & Conley, 1986).

However, the problem is that the professional bureaucratic model does not fit the realities of practice (Sergiovanni, 1987b). The professional bureaucratic model assumes that teaching and related processes such as supervision and evaluation are applied sciences. In practice, however, professional knowledge is rarely taken directly from theory or research and applied uniformly to standard problems, but more frequently is created as professionals solve problems and make decisions. The professional bureaucracy model has other problems: it discourages teamwork and interaction, increases the problem of isolation among teachers, and proposes too much decentralization and too much autonomy for individuals (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

Cooperative Professional Bureaucratic Model

Typically, successful schools are a combination of the pure bureaucracy and the professional bureaucracy. They resemble the pure bureaucracy by making clear to members certain non-negotiable imperatives to which all are expected to adhere. At the same time, they resemble the professional bureaucracy by allowing workers wide discretion as to how they will function day-by-day while those imperatives are pursued (Sergiovanni, 1987b). Schools designed as cooperative professional bureaucracies have a strong sense of purpose; teachers are allowed wide discretion but not complete autonomy in achieving those purposes. Further, the work of schooling is organized in a way that encourages teachers to be interdependent. Teachers find they can be more successful when they work together and share together as they plan, diagnose, teach, and evaluate. Such cooperative arrangements not only help reduce isolation and promote social interaction but also help teachers improve their classroom practices (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

Administrators of effective schools realize that *coordination* does not require control from the top down. Although principals of effective schools are invariably characterized as *strong leaders,* theirstrength does not stem from their status or from their ability to control the activities of individual teachers. In fact, these principals make conscious efforts to minimize the differences in status that exist between themselves and their teachers and to avoid dictating solutions to problems or otherwise limiting the discretion of teachers. Instead, they assume primary responsibility for certain key processes and they enlist teachers to assist in those processes and to take part in decision making (Bacharach & Conley, 1986).

In an effective system of school management, teachers and administrators agree together on goals and objectives that will guide their separate and collective efforts. These goals and objectives provide the basic yardsticks for monitoring and evaluating school programs and for determining staff development needs. Such an orientation to school management is consistent with a great majority of the effective schools research findings and with an entirely separate body of theory and research on effectiveness in private-sector organizations (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). A characteristic common to successful organizations is that they rely on cooperation and teamwork as the work unfolds (Peters and Waterman, 1982).

Darling-Hammond (1985) points out that teacher involvement in school decision making is relatively haphazard. While teachers in some school districts participate in decisions concerning textbook selection, curriculum development, and staff development, in other school districts these decisions are made primarily by administrators or school board members. In very few schools or districts do teachers have an effective voice in decisions about class scheduling, course requirements, student placements, program development, or teacher assignments. In even fewer schools do teachers have any voice in personnel decisions concerning the hiring, evaluation, and tenure of either teachers or administrators.

Three reasons for involving teachers in management and decision making were drawn from Darling-Hammond (1985):

> First, the span of control in schools is extremely wide. Both because of limited time for supervision and limited expertise in teaching specialties, the typical principal cannot do a very good job of evaluation and staff development. The time and expertise of principals are often inadequate to the task of critiquing, assisting, and monitoring the performance of teachers in a serious, concerted fashion.
>
> Second, the professional growth of teachers is not particularly central to the concerns of administrators. The professional growth of teachers may be central to teaching, to teacher efficacy, and job satisfaction, but it is peripheral to the day-to-day tasks of administrators.
>
> Finally, the designation of some decisions and tasks as those of management and others as those of teachers is, in part, arbitrary. To the extent that any policy or practice affects the quality of instruction delivered to students, it is a concern of teachers. If teaching is to be considered not only a job but also a profession, then teachers must be concerned about not only salaries and working conditions but also the interests of students.

Studies of school improvement and school effectiveness suggest that neither school administrators nor teachers, working independently, have the capacity to resolve the issues or accomplish the tasks necessary for school improvement. The ideal organizational structure appears to be one in which leadership is broadly distributed and by which collegial work among teachers is given direction, continuity, and depth (Little & Bird, 1984).

School-Based Management

Some researchers argue that the present bureaucratic school organization stifles creativity and blocks teachers and principals from exercising their best judgement on matters that should be decided at the school-building level (Boyer, cited in Futrell, 1986). Others charge that *hierarchical bureaucracy* is "paralyzing American education" and assert that it is essential to return authority and decision making to those closest to the students (Sizer, 1984).

The National Governors' Association agrees. One of the recommendations in *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (NGA, 1986) is to "provide incentives and technical assistance to districts to promote school-site management and improvement." The report argues that:

> providing discretionary resources to schools gives them a major incentive to improve. Where this has been tried, it has unleashed creative energies and helped schools develop a diversity of approaches and strategies to meet particular goals. Among the ways this can be accomplished are to identify and remove legal and organizational barriers to school-site management; to provide technical assistance to encourage local experimentation; to promote school-based budgeting and school-based hiring of teachers; and to provide resources that schools can use at their own discretion.

School-based management stems from a belief in the individual school as the fundamental decision-making unit within the educational system. The faculty and principal of a school constitute—or should constitute—a natural management team. School-based management differs from most current forms of school district organization in which the central office dominates the decision-making process (Lindelow, 1981). In districts organized for school-based management, each school is a relatively autonomous unit of which the principal becomes the chief executive officer. The great responsibility shouldered by the principal is matched by an equivalent measure of authority. With both the responsibility and the authority, the principal is free to become the leader of his or her school. The principal and other school personnel design the budget, hire instructors and other school personnel, and work out the curriculum (Lindelow, 1981).

If the school is to function as the primary decision-making unit, however, policy makers must give school personnel the necessary authority to address and solve educational problems. According to Guthrie (1986) such a management transformation is best achieved through: (1) principals who function as chief executive officers, (2) school advisory councils, (3) school-site budgeting and accounting, and (4) annual planning and performance reports. As Guthrie (1986) points out, in districts that use a school-based management system, no teacher can be assigned to a school without the principal's approval. It is impractical and unfair to hold a principal responsible for the effectiveness of a school if he or she has no control over who is assigned to teach in that school. To function effectively as chief executive officers, principals must have discretion over both school resources and personnel selection. School-based management fixes responsibilities where they belong and closes the gap between the authority for initiating and operating school programs and the responsibility for their success or failure (Lindelow, 1981).

The Missouri Conference on Education (1984), in a study of the factors that facilitate or constrain the work of principals, found that responsibility without authority and lack of recognition were cited repeatedly by principals as obstacles to effectiveness. The principals expressed frustration with the fact that they were held accountable for expenditures, staff performance or student achievement without being given the authority needed to discharge their responsibility. Once given the authority, however, principals must be held accountable for the manner in which they allocate those resources and manage that personnel.

Although sometimes a school will function poorly despite the efforts of an able principal, a school with a weak principal almost never remains effective for very long. For this reason, Guthrie (1986) proposes that in a school district practicing schoolbased management, no one in the central office should receive a higher salary than the principals. In addition, the most able teachers in each school should be able to earn as much as their principals. Such a salary structure would end the current pattern of promoting teachers into central office assignments simply because the classroom affords so few avenues to professional growth, higher salaries, and status.

The importance of recognizing and rewarding effective principals is acknowledged in the report of the National Governors' Association (NGA, 1986). The report recommends that policy makers devise ways to "reward principals and schools for performance and effectiveness," noting that:

> motivation to improve schools will be greater if there are rewards for success. Principals should be held accountable for school performance, especially if they are given the flexibility and resources to meet the goals set for the school. This can be done in a number of ways. Career ladders for administrators can offer a powerful motivation. States can also reward schools that are making progress toward their goals and publicly acknowledge outstanding school leaders.

While the extent of teacher involvement varies widely, all site-management schools have involved teachers to some extent. Sharing decision-making authority at the school site enables faculty to be personally involved in decisions that directly relate to their day-to-day activities within the school (Lindelow, 1981). Giving faculty members substantial discretion in decision making encourages their productive participation in activities aimed at school reform and develops a sense of partnership or ownership with the school (Guthrie, 1986).

The relationship between the central office and the school site will be the one most changed by the implementation of school-based management. Because the site administrator will inherit power and authority from the central office, the roles of the central-office administrators will change nearly as much as the role of the principal (Lindelow, 1981). Central administrators become managers of the school system instead of its bosses; they become support and evaluative staff for the schools instead of directors. The central office focuses on developing student and staff performance standards, offering technical assistance to schools, determining how much funding each school should get, and carrying out system-wide planning, monitoring, and evaluation (Lindelow, 1981).

The superintendent continues to be the chief administrator of the district and the person responsible to the Board for administrative decisions. Experience in districts that have tried school-based management has shown that strong support from the superintendent is absolutely necessary for its proper implementation. Proponents of school-based management say the job at the top is made easier when the entire system becomes more accountable and responsive to client needs and that superintendents enthusiastically support the concept once they realize that it can help them meet the responsibilities of their office in a more effective and efficient manner (Lindelow, 1981). However, changes in the roles of the superintendent, central office staff, and principal require extensive retraining if the new management system is to survive any real challenge. Otherwise, instead of working with the new system when a crisis arises, everyone will tend to fall back on the workings of the familiar, centralized system and the behaviors that worked for them before (Lindelow, 1981).

In a change to school-based management, the role of the School Board does not change significantly. The Board continues to provide general direction for the district by establishing goals and policy statements, keeping informed about the district's progress toward goals, and acting as a decision maker of last resort. Support by the School Board is vital, however, to the success of school-based management (Lindelow, 1981).

School-based management is often found allied with the community-involvement movement. On the one hand, public involvement enhances public support of the schools, while on the other, schools become more responsive to community and student needs. Increased community and staff participation in school decision making has been an important component of school-based management wherever it has been implemented. In general, teachers, parents, and often students (at the secondary level) participate in decision making as members of school advisory councils, which are usually distinct from the traditional PTAs or PTOs. Advisory councils vary widely in form, but generally they are composed of the principal, classroom teachers, other school personnel, parents, non-parent citizens, and secondary-school students (Lindelow, 1981).

Recognizing that educational reform has evolved from "cosmetic changes in course requirements to a radical restructuring of the school environment," the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987) endorses school-based change and the realignment of responsibilities that such change would entail. The report of the Commission stated that a *revolution* in education will require changes in the way schools actually operate so that individual schools will have more control over curricular, personnel, and budget matters. The Commission also emphasized that the schools will need competent, skilled, visionary leadership of a kind not often seen before.

Diagnosing School Management

The research on organizational management has identified characteristics of effective organizations. The following 10 questions based on those characteristics can be used as a diagnostic tool to help local school districts assess the effectiveness of their management and identify areas of weakness. The questions, adapted from Bacharach and Conley (1986), focus on the school as a work environment and on factors that make this work environment effective or ineffective.

1. Does your school establish a consensus on goals? Effective management uses a process for defining goals that involves staff, middle management, and upper-level management.

2. Does your school have coherent managerial policies? The achievement of organizational goals depends on coherent managerial policies that specify the operational means by which goals can be accomplished. Coherent managerial policies also establish logical links between new management decisions and decisions already made or anticipated.

3. Does your school encourage open communication? Effective management fosters a free exchange of ideas and information among employees and managers, as well as an open discussion of grievances.

4. Does your school have a structure that encourages participation? Effectively managed organizations allow employees to have a say in strategic organizational decisions and in decisions that directly affect their work.

5. Do managers in your school use positive supervisory behaviors? Research has distinguished between positive and negative supervisory behaviors. Positive behaviors include showing appreciation and actively and visibly providing and soliciting feedback. Negative behaviors are judgmental in nature and usually involve criticism; they elicit resentment and apprehension. Research has consistently shown that it is important to train supervisors in the techniques of positive supervision.

6. Does your school design work activities effectively? Well-designed work activities are characterized by clear expectations that are not in conflict with one another. In well-designed work activities, individual staff know what is expected of them.

7. Does your school have a constructive system for evaluating personnel? Effective management requires the use of evaluation systems that reflect the actual activities of employees. When the focus is on specific activities, evaluation can provide constructive feedback that has the potential to improve job performance. Organizations in the private sector spend large sums of money on the development of performance appraisal and job evaluation systems, and they devote considerable time to the training of evaluators. In many professional organizations, peer review plays an important role in the evaluation process.

8. Has your school implemented career development programs? In effectively managed organizations, employees have opportunities for career development and a sense of career movement. Increasingly, organizations in the private sector are finding new ways of giving employees opportunities for career advancement.

9. Are individual staff members respected in your school? In the private sector, there is growing respect for individual employees. Increasingly, managers have come to recognize that an individual's self-esteem is an important predictor of his or her performance.

10. Does your school have a culture of cooperation? Effective management emphasizes a culture of cooperation, not a culture of bureaucratic control.

The organizational research paints a picture of the traditional bureaucratic structure of schools as one that impedes school improvement efforts by constricting the use of the knowledge and talents of school staffs, limiting involvement and acceptance of responsibility at lower bureaucratic levels, restricting communication flow, and establishing management and regulatory tasks as priorities. This picture offers a strong basis for arguing that schools should be re-structured to provide school-based management and collegial decision making. It follows that school administrators should be trained to be leaders in such re-structured systems.

Section Two
Research on the Competencies of Effective Administrators

Identifying Skills and Competencies Related to Job Factors

Many studies have been published on effective schools since Edmonds (1979) and Brookover and his associates (1979) called attention to the fact that certain schools are more effective than others with similar demographic characteristics. While little research has been done on leadership at the district level, the effective schools research has shown some recurring patterns in the characteristics of effective schools that are either directly or indirectly related to principal effectiveness (Fullan, 1982; Manasse, 1985; Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore, & Ouston, 1979; Venezky & Winfield, 1979). Those characteristics are strong administrative leadership, a school climate conducive to learning, a school-wide emphasis on instruction, high teacher expectations for student achievement, and systematic monitoring of pupil performance.

While there is as yet no single, commonly agreed upon definition of what constitutes an effective as contrasted with an ineffective principal, it is hard to improve on Goldhammer, et al.'s (1972, pp. 1-2) characterization of principals in the *beacons of brilliance* schools as charismatic, enthusiastic, confident, service-oriented, and hardworking, or of principals in the *potholes of pestilence* schools as weak leaders, unenthusiastic, laissez-faire, and serving out their time. Despite the lack of a comprehensive definition for principal effectiveness, researchers agree that certain principals are effective. Not only do students in their schools perform well academically, but also members of their communities feel a common sense of purpose and have a positive attitude about what is occurring in their schools (Manasse, 1985).

Most of the earlier studies produced lists of school administrators' job responsibilities (Duke, 1982; McCurdy, 1983) or described general categories of competencies or skill dimensions (AASA, 1982; see Appendix A). An early study by Burch and Danley (1980) identified 10 essential supervisory roles:

host-ceremonial, formal communicator, external contacts, information and dissemination, resource allocator, training and development, observation and evaluation, motivational, crisis management, and maintenance. Another study, identifying the competencies required to function effectively in the principalship, was done by Lyons (1981) who surveyed a random sample of principals and superintendents about their perceptions of the competencies and levels of proficiency needed by prospective principals. The results of the survey produced such items as "consult with district personnel on educational and organizational matters," "establish attendance accounting procedures," "keep teachers abreast of current educational improvements," and "evaluate school personnel."

More recently, the School Improvement Program at the Johns Hopkins University (Gottfredson & Hybl, 1986) developed the Inventory of the School Administrator's Job to determine those job factors common to the jobs of all principals, those factors specific to principals' jobs in certain kinds of school systems, and the degree of importance principals attached to each factor. The most striking impression created by the responses of more than 1000 completed inventories was that principals have an enormously complex and demanding job. In general, the range of responsibilities of principals was so varied and complex that factor analysis was used to identify those dimensions underlying the diverse activities important in principals' jobs. The results of this analysis implied that 10 factors underlie the much larger number of specific job elements. The following list summarizes each of these 10 job factors, defines the job elements included under each, and the degree of importance as perceived by principals (Gottfredson & Hybl, 1986):

> **Student Interaction and Social Control.** Job elements within this job factor were tasks or activities involving interaction with individual students in matters related to discipline, attendance problems, academic difficulties; activities related to maintaining order and civility in the school through direct interaction with students; praising students who were doing well in school; and promoting classroom management. Most principals rated the job elements associated with this factor as somewhat below average in importance (i.e., less important than other aspects of their jobs, not unimportant in an absolute sense).
>
> **Administration and Planning.** Job elements involved fiscal management, planning for school improvement, evaluating the effectiveness of school practices, establishing policies or operating procedures to cover most day-today decision making, and

assessing needs and school climate. The elements associated with this factor were rated overall as about average in importance (i.e., as important as other aspects of the principals' jobs).

Personnel Management. Job elements included arranging social activities to promote collegiality, transferring or recommending the transfer of employees, arbitrating disputes, arranging for in-service training, holding staff meetings, and delegating responsibilities to staff. Public school principals rated job elements exemplifying this factor as slightly below average in importance, but Catholic and other private school principals typically rated these job elements as above average in importance.

Observation and Feedback. Job elements included observing and reviewing with individual teachers their performance in instruction and classroom management, discussing formal performance evaluations with staff, and providing timely feedback on observed strengths and weaknesses for faculty and other staff members. The job elements related to this job factor were typically rated as highly important by principals in schools of all types. A clear pattern emerged from the results implying that these job elements are the most important part of the jobs of most principals, and there were no significant differences in the rated importance of this job factor according to school location, grade level, or auspices.

Instructional Management. Job elements included selecting achievement or competency tests and monitoring the school testing program, analyzing the curriculum to ensure curriculum coverage and articulation, setting specific educational objectives, establishing academic requirements, and planning or organizing curriculum-development activities. Elementary school principals typically rated job elements representing this factor as slightly above average in importance, and the importance of these job elements was typically regarded as lower than average in middle or junior high schools, and lower still in importance in high schools.

Policy Development. Job elements entailed activities to establish or modify policies, especially those related to attendance and discipline and to overseeing or monitoring the activities of others in these areas. High school principals tended to rate job elements related to this factor as especially important, followed by middle/junior and then elementary school principals.

Parent and Community Relations. Job elements included meeting with parents and citizens to promote the school or discuss school programs, creating concrete programs to involve parents in school activities, assessing public opinion, and developing a public relations plan for the school. Job elements related to this factor tended to be rated somewhat below average in importance in schools of all types.

Coping With Disorder. Job elements included unscheduled activities such as removing intruders from the school; rendering first aid; interacting with police, fire fighters, or emergency medical personnel; testifying in court; and trouble-shooting incidents involving disgruntled persons. Principals typically rated job elements related to this factor as considerably below average in importance.

School-System Interaction. Job elements included negotiating with the district office or diocese to revise, change, or update educational goals and objectives or to forestall policies destructive of the school program; interpreting directives from the district office or diocese; or conforming school plans or practices to a policy established by higher officials. Public school principals rated these job elements only slightly below average in importance, Catholic school principals tended to rate these elements as below average in importance, and (as might be expected) private school principals rated these elements considerably below average in importance.

Keeping-up-to-Date. Job elements included reading to identify useful research findings or to determine how federal, state, or local regulations affect the school; visiting other schools to identify effective practices; and conducting in-service training. Principals generally rated these job elements as somewhat above average in importance -- especially Catholic and private school principals.

This study provides support for other findings on the complexity of the principal's job and provides insight into the relative importance principals attach to each set of responsibilities. It does not provide, however, much insight into the skills needed to accomplish these responsibilities.

Klopf, Scheldon, and Brennan (1982) developed a taxonomy of the functions of a school principal and the competencies a principal needs to fulfill those functions. Competencies were defined as the specific abilities that an individual has or can develop, such as the ability to interview, consult, plan, train, or negotiate. Their "Functions and Competencies" includes sections on the learning environment, learning needs of children, the instructional program, staff development, using community resources, building management, and financial management.

Drake and Miller (1982) identified the "essential competencies required by principals in the area of community education." Both an *ideal* and a *real* profile of the minimal community education competencies required of principals were generated. A total of 25 competency statements were developed. They were broken down into eight essential task areas: philosophy, goal setting, and policy implementation; program development; program management; developing climate; personnel management; financial management; community relations; and program evaluation. For each of the task areas, minimal competencies and indicators of competency attainment were listed.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 1986) completed a two-phase Standards Project that: (1) sought to identify those factors that make the difference between a quality school and one that needs a change in direction; and (2) to identify the skills, traits, and capabilities needed by the kinds of principals who develop K-8 schools of outstanding quality. The second-phase report, *Proficiencies for Principals,* groups the various skills and characteristics involved into four proficiency strands: Experience and Education, Leadership Proficiencies, Supervisory Proficiencies, and Administrative Proficiencies. Under each strand are a number of exemplars of the abilities and skills K-8 principals need and that professional preparation and continuing development activities should help engender. Two instruments are included in the report to help principals in self assessment and developing a plan for professional growth.

Research on Competencies That Differentiate Effective Principals

Many of the recent research efforts have been devoted to identifying those competencies that differentiate between principals of effective schools and those of average or less effective schools. Sweeney (1982) reviewed eight of the earlier, more valid and extensive studies on whether principals made a difference in the schools and, if so, which leadership behaviors were associated with positive outcomes. The evidence presented in those studies clearly indicated that principals made a difference – leadership behavior was positively associated with school outcomes. Those specific leadership behaviors that were consistently associated with effective schools were emphasizing achievement, setting instructional strategies, providing an orderly school atmosphere, frequently monitoring student performance, coordinating instruction, and supporting teachers.

Effective and Typical Principals

Especially informative regarding principal leadership is the review prepared by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) in which they identified two types of principals, *effective* and *typical*. They found that the way in which principals address educational goals reveals interesting characteristics about them. Effective principals had clear goals, both long- and short-term, and their priorities dealt with the happiness and achievement of students. Effective principals tried to achieve a balance between task and interpersonal relationships. Their first priority, however, was to have a good school, and, when necessary, this task orientation took precedence over human relations. These principals applied the task ethic to themselves, and they viewed themselves as instructional leaders who were responsible for the quality of their schools.

The effective principals communicated high expectations for teachers that were coupled with the assumption that programs would always be changing to better serve learners. Furthermore, effective principals seemed to attend to all aspects of the educational endeavor. They set specific goals and held teachers to them. They also had knowledge of the instructional practices of their teachers, and, in direct and indirect ways, they saw to it that the teachers had the knowledge and skills necessary for program improvement. Effective principals also took actions to secure the necessary support from the community and from higher administration for the school improvement efforts they endorsed. According to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982, p. 27), "rather than being pro-active as the effective principal appeared to be, the typical principal tended to be primarily responsive – responsive to district demands and the demands from the many other sources of problems encountered everyday."

High-Performing Principals

One of the more extensive and rigorous attempts to identify the competencies of effective principals was carried out by the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM). The Council was established by legislation to identify high-performing principals, to validate their competencies scientifically, and to use such competencies as a basis for training, development, selection, certification, and compensation. After reviewing the literature on managerial competencies, Lake (1981) concluded that most studies of competency were simple *list-type* studies, consisting of lists created and then ranked by various audiences on the basis of importance. With one or two exceptions (Ellett, 1977), such lists were never validated against performance criteria.

After developing a research base, Lake recommended to the Council that they conduct their own research into principal competencies using a multiple-method, multiple-site process. After several preliminary steps, the FCEM (Croghan & Lake, 1984) study selected 14 high and 14 moderate performers to participate in intensive behavioral-event-indicator interviews that were then content analyzed. This study identified *essential* competencies considered prerequisites for *adequate performance* as a school principal: a high concern for school mission, a concern for the school's image, an ability to manage by consensus, and an ability to direct quality improvement. These competencies were demonstrated about as frequently by *moderate-performing principals* as they were by *high-performing principals*.

In addition, the study identified optimal competencies that were demonstrated significantly more often by the principals whose students were performing well beyond expectations. The high-performing principals demonstrated competencies of superior analytic ability, a strong sense of control, and the ability to be objective in their perceptions. Also, the high performers were persuasive, had a high commitment to quality, and were able to bring about focused change in the schools as needed (Croghan & Lake, 1984).

Croghan and Lake (1984) combined and weighted the findings of a number of studies to develop lists of High-Performing Competencies and Basic Competencies. The studies on which the lists were based include the FCEM study (Huff, Lake, & Schaalman, 1982); the Martinko study (1983); an analysis of the dimensions used in three well-developed Florida assessment programs (those of Broward, Dade, and Lee counties); studies by Boyatzis (1982); a study of the content and criterion-related validity of the NASSP Assessment Center ratings (Schmidt et al., 1980); and work carried out in Palm Beach County on behavioral indicators.

In categorizing the competencies, the terms *high-performing* (HP) and *basic* (B) were used. It should be noted that moderate-performing and high-performing principals both practiced the basic competencies. In a sense, those competencies were essential in order for the schools to be considered at least *average*. The high-performing competencies were those generic areas that differentiated the high-performing principals from their moderate-performing counterparts. These are summarized in Figure 1. For a detailed description of each of the competencies and the behavioral indicators subsumed under each, see Appendix B.

Effective vs. Ineffective Principal Behavior

Concerned with the principal's role in creating an effective school, Russell, Mazzarella, White, and Maurer (1985) designed a study to identify the specific behaviors of secondary school principals that might be linked with particular characteristics of effective schools. The research team identified eight secondary school characteristics that were (1) observable, (2) not primarily the result of student academic success, and (3) could be directly and strongly affected by principal behavior. They interviewed selected study participants regarding effective and ineffective principal behaviors related to each of the eight effective school characteristics. The study participants, selected from high school and junior high schools in Oregon and Kentucky, included administrators, teachers, school staff, parents, and students.

Effective behavior was defined as that which observers wished all principals would perform under similar circumstances. Ineffective behavior was defined as that which would cause someone to doubt the competence of anyone who did it repeatedly. *Ineffective* did not mean just lacking effectiveness, but rather actually being counterproductive.

Figure 1

HIGH-PERFORMING COMPETENCIES

On the basis of all the evidence reviewed and other relevant considerations, the following is a list of High-Performing Competencies that appear to differentiate between average- and high-performing principals.

- proactive orientation
- managing interaction
- decisiveness
- persuasiveness
- interpersonal search
- achievement motivation
- information search
- management control
- concept formation
- organizational ability
- conceptual flexibility
- self-presentation

BASIC COMPETENCIES

The following is a list of basic competencies — that is, competencies that are required to perform the role of principal adequately. These competencies are important to perform well as a principal but do not differentiate between excellent- and average-performing principals.

- commitment to school mission
- delegation
- concern for image
- written communication
- tactical adaptability
- organizational sensitivity
- developmental orientation
- technical knowledge

From: Croghan and Lake, 1984

Observers, researchers, and experts agreed upon 133 ineffective behaviors and 202 effective behaviors. For example, under the effective school characteristic *Orderly and Studious Environment*, an effective behavior was identified as "enforces discipline personally with students." An ineffective behavior was identified as "permits student behavior that creates a disorderly environment and disrupts classroom time" (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985). A complete list of these behaviors, categorized under the associated effective school characteristic, is in Appendix C.

Another study designed to identify the differences between effective and ineffective principal behavior was carried out at the University of Texas at Austin, where a team of researchers (Rutherford, 1985) studied the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals. Data were collected from observations of and interviews with the principals, from interviews with teachers who taught in the principals' schools, and from interviews with key central office staff members in the school districts. Some clear distinctions between more-effective and less-effective principals emerged from these data. The findings are summarized below:

> **Vision.** When asked, "What is your vision for this school — your long-range goals and expectations?", effective principals, without hesitation, began to list their goals for their schools. The principals responded with an enthusiasm that reflected a personal belief in and active support of these goals. Less-effective principals usually responded with a long pause and then a nonspecific statement. The less-effective principals had no vision for their schools; they focused on maintaining tranquility in the here and now.
>
> **Translating the Vision.** The teachers of those principals who had visions for the future of their schools described these schools as good places for students and for teachers. The teachers were aware of and could express their principals' visions for the schools — though not necessarily in the same language that the principals used. They also had a general understanding of their principals' expectations. Teachers working under less-effective principals seldom spoke of their school or of their own work with enthusiasm and excitement. Teachers in schools headed by less-effective principals lacked a common understanding of schoolwide goals and expectations.

A Supportive Environment. Effective principals allocated funding and materials in ways that maximized teaching effectiveness and, thus, student achievement. In addition, they selectively and systematically applied such other support mechanisms as advantageous scheduling, careful assignment of teachers, and the dispensing of recognition to achieve these ends. To them, a good school environment was one that enhances students' learning and development.

Less-effective principals were primarily concerned with not rocking the boat. The environment created by the less-effective principals was generally placid and non-threatening. It placed a few demands on teachers, but it was also ambiguous and without rewards. Because teachers did not know exactly what was expected of them, they tended to chart their own courses.

Monitoring. The less-effective principals frequently said, "My teachers are all professionals, so I leave them alone to do their work. If they need something, they know that they can come to me." The very general way in which these principals described teacher performance suggested that they lacked insight into the daily behaviors of teachers. Monitoring was an activity they carried on in a limited and superficial way — most often, only to the extent required by the school district.

The more-effective principals provided not only specific details about the performance of their teachers but also insights into why the teachers performed as they did. The more-effective principals took time to discover what was going on in the classrooms, while their less-effective counterparts spent most of their working days handling management or administrative tasks. The more-effective principals gathered information through formal classroom observations, but they used informal methods as well. These included walking the hallways, ducking in and out of classrooms, attending grade-level and departmental meetings, and holding spontaneous conversations with individual teachers.

Intervening. The effective principals looked for positive features and then directly and sincerely recognized and praised the teachers responsible for them. Such actions supported the goals and expectations that these principals had established for their schools. Although they tended to focus on the positive aspects of their schools, the effective principals also spotted problems and took necessary corrective actions.

Because the less-effective principals monitored in a limited and superficial way, they lacked specific information about what was happening in their schools. Thus they were not able to offer teachers much praise and support. Nor could they readily identify and deal with problems, unless those problems were obvious and pressing.

Instructional Leadership Behaviors of Effective Principals

Larsen (1987) investigated the relationship between student achievement and the instructional leadership of principals in a sample of schools identified as *high achieving* and *low achieving*. Principals and teachers were asked to rate the degree to which each of a set of 29 instructional leadership behaviors was implemented by the principal at their school site. The frequency of implementation was compared for high-achieving schools and low-achieving schools.

The findings of the study included the following:

- teachers of high-achieving schools rated their principals as demonstrating instructional leadership behavior significantly more often than did the teachers in low-achieving schools;

- there was a greater degree of discrepancy in the low-achieving schools between the teachers' reports of the principal's instructional leadership behavior and the principals' reports of their own behavior; and

- ten of the 29 instructional behaviors were found to differ significantly in their frequency of implementation in high- and low-achieving schools.

The following are the principal instructional behaviors that differed in the degree of implementation frequency between high- and low-achieving schools. The principal:

- ☐ ensures that school instructional goals are developed congruent with district policy;
- ☐ ensures that instructional goals are clearly communicated to everyone;
- ☐ communicates high expectations for student academic performance to staff;
- ☐ participates in formal and/or informal discussions concerning instruction as it impacts student achievement;
- ☐ ensures that systematic procedures for monitoring student progress are used by staff;
- ☐ assists teachers in securing available resources for program implementation;
- ☐ makes regular visits to classrooms;
- ☐ evaluates curricular programs;
- ☐ observes innovative curricular programs; and
- ☐ establishes a safe/orderly school environment with a clear discipline code.

Problem-Solving Strategies of Effective Principals

As the above discussion indicates, evidence of distinctly different patterns of principal behaviors has begun to accumulate and efforts have been made to distinguish between patterns of behaviors that contribute more and less effectively to the quality of school life. Much of educational administration research has investigated school administrator decision making (Greenfield, 1985). According to this concept, principals are faced with a continuing series of choices and must make those choices that best suit the context in which they find themselves. Alternative sources of action must be weighed against the goals, beliefs, values, abilities, and expectations of everyone affected by the choice.

However, Leithwood and Stager (1986) suggest that *decision making* may be too simple a concept to describe the functioning of effective school administration. *Problem solving* might be a better description of what is required. An administrator's world is contingent; dealing with it effectively involves creating solutions as well as making choices. Creating effective solutions depends on the problem-solving strategies principals have developed to make use of their knowledge and skills. Effective problem-solving strategies empower principals to act more flexibly in creating effective solutions and achieving their goals in their own schools.

Leithwood and Stager (1986) studied the problem solving of 22 moderately and highly effective principals. *Moderately effective* was a designation given to principals whose goals were rather narrowly defined by managerial and/or staff interpersonal concerns; they played little role in the curriculum or instructional decision making in their schools. A limited range of decision-making forms and procedures was used in the moderately effective principals' schools; the tendency was toward unilateral decision making regarding matters about which they were most concerned and complete delegation of many other decisions. The research suggests there is compelling evidence that such a pattern of practice has minimal effects on student outcomes.

The *highly effective* designation was applied to principals whose goals were directly linked to student growth across an array of complex cognitive and affective outcomes. These principals were actively involved in curricular and instructional decisions and displayed situational leadership skills. They encouraged extensive involvement of staff in making decisions. This pattern of practice has a substantial impact on student growth (Leithwood & Stager, 1986).

Most of the principals in the highly effective group stressed the importance of collecting information to facilitate the finding of suitable solutions. Information was obtained from many external sources, and everyone likely to have something useful to contribute was involved in some way in the solution process. The moderately effective principals in the sample, on the other hand, based solutions on fairly limited sources and amounts of information and frequently did not draw on staff who might have been able to contribute to an effective solution.

This confirms the findings of the FCEM studies (Croghan & Lake, 1984) that high-performing principals search for and gather many different kinds of information before arriving at an understanding of an event or a problem; use formal and informal observation, and search and interact with others to gather information about the environment; and are aware of the breadth (number of sources) and depth (what is learned from each relevant source) of information search.

Croghan and Lake (1984) also found that high-performing principals were able to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when discussing problem solving or making a decision. These principals had the ability to do the following:

☐ view events from different (multiple) perspectives simultaneously;

☐ keep different group members' perspectives on the table for discussion in group meetings;

☐ discover and use these conflicting or different views of events in problem solving and dialogue;

☐ take into account the perspective of subordinates or managers in the their own unit (e.g., department, school) and *significant others* outside the their unit and organization in planning and problem solving;

☐ form and use multiple concepts in problem solving and interpersonal and group interaction; and

☐ include people from groups with different perspectives in planning groups (e.g., students, parents, and citizens of the school community).

The highly effective principals in the Leithwood and Stager study (1986) were much more aware of their own problem-solving style and, without exception, could describe it easily. The processes used by moderately- and highly-effective principals differed in three respects:

1. Highly effective principals all appeared to use a fairly deliberate problem-solving model to guide their strategy, and this model usually suggested an optimal sequence of steps to solution.

2. There was more agreement evident in the responses of highly effective, as compared with moderately effective, principals concerning the elements that must be included in any strategy for it to be successful. These elements included: communication with all those touched by the problem; some form of participation in the process by all those with a stake in the problem; and the collection of as much information as was feasible.

3. Highly effective principals devoted much more attention to initial clarification than did their moderately effective colleagues. They were concerned about clarifying, for example, the type of problem they were facing (e.g., individual problem vs. joint problem, staff problem vs. lead teacher problem), their own position concerning the problem, and the role they should play in the problem-solving process.

The FCEM studies (Croghan & Lake, 1984) found that high-performing principals express a readiness to make decisions and render judgments. For example, they:

- ☐ express little ambivalence about decisions that have been made (but may recognize alternatives);
- ☐ are forceful and self confident in making decisions;
- ☐ and, once a decision is made, take actions and commit themselves and others.

Although references to relationships with other people were included among the responses of both the moderately and highly effective principals in the Leithwood and Stager study (1986), this was a much more pronounced tendency among the highly effective group. The descriptions provided by highly effective principals included a central role for other people; they used such phrases as "consultative but not wishy-washy," "a cooperative effort," "rule by consensus," "shared and collegial," and "helping others solve problems."

Most of the principals involved others in problem solving in some way with some problems, although such involvement was much more pronounced among highly effective principals. Leithwood and Stager (1986) found that principals differed considerably in how they arranged such involvement. Most of the highly effective principals had formally established procedures and structures to provide routinely for group problem solving. They had in place such structures as staff planning committees, principal's cabinets, and divisional organizations of teachers. The development of these structures appears to depend on the ability of the principal to anticipate recurring future problems and classify problems according to whom they might affect and who is able to contribute to their solutions.

Several of the reasons for involving others in problem solving were common to both highly and moderately effective principals. These were to gather better information, to increase ownership of the solution, and (less frequently) "to bounce off solutions." However, highly effective principals offered three additional reasons that help to explain the nature of the involvement they were concerned with. These principals, first of all, involved staff in many more school-wide management decisions than did the moderately effective group. Secondly, highly effective principals involved staff because they genuinely believed that such involvement would lead to better solutions. Finally, almost all highly effective principals appeared to view staff involvement in a specific problem as an opportunity for those staff members to increase their own problem-solving skills for the future (Leithwood & Stager, 1986). (See Figure 2).

Personal Qualities of Effective Principals

Personal qualities, traits, and moral values are difficult to measure and categorize. Nevertheless, certain personal attributes are more likely to be exhibited by effective or high-performing principals. For example, Croghan and Lake (1984) found high-performing principals were more pro-active. These principals:

- ☐ took the role of being fully *in charge* and responsible for all that happened in a situation or a job;
- ☐ reflected an *internal control* orientation and behaved on the assumption that they could be the *cause* and could move events, create change and achieve goals; and
- ☐ initiated action and readily took responsibility for all aspects of the situation — even beyond ordinary boundaries — and for success and failure in task accomplishment.

FIGURE 2: PRINCIPALS' PROBLEM CLASSIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT; PRINCIPALS' PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES; AND INFLUENCES ON PRINCIPALS' PROBLEM SOLVING PROCESSES

	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS	MODERATELY EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS
1. **Nature of Classification**	assign more importance to "number of people involved" as a problem category	assign less importance to "number of people involved" as a problem category
	use an explicit sorting process in daily problem solving	have no explicit sorting process: they "react"
	use, as major sorting categories, "who is involved" and/or "time"	
2. **Determination of Priorities**	give emphasis to programs, overall school directions, building staff morale, and excitement about programs	give emphasis to building or maintaining interpersonal relationships
	provide arguments in support of priorities	provide little rationale for priorities
	work harder to manage their time to free themselves for their "proper" work (i.e., program development, planning, initiating change)	are marginally more satisfied with how they spend their time, but express desire to spend more time in classrooms, with students and staff
	mention more specific strategies to control paperwork	
3. **Problem Difficulty**	tend to label as easy problems, those encountered before, for which they have clear procedures	
	find hardest problems are those outside their control, those impacting widely, and those concerned with staff morale	find hardest problems are those involving teacher firings or other less critical personnel problems
	insist that there are some entirely new problems facing principals, and see clearly the ways in which problems are related to former similar ones	tend to view most problems as familiar or "old", and display a greater tendency to be bored by them
4. **Overall Style**	refer more often to solving problems with others (e.g., "collaborative" or "shared")	
	are "front-end" risk-takers, but careful information collectors	are "tail-end" risk-takers, and less careful to collect comprehensive information
	are more reflective about their own style and process	

5. **Specific Strategies**	use a more deliberate model for problem solving	tend to use more imprecise "rules of thumb"
	agree that any strategy must include certain elements (i.e., communications, participation by stakeholders, extensive information collection)	
	clarify many facets of problem-solving situation (e.g., type of problem, own position, own and others' roles)	may use strategies (e.g., not delaying) which prevent much clarification
	have organizational structures in place for group problem solving	
	have, as reasons for involving others, those cited by moderately effective principals and, in addition: to help with school-wide problem management; to produce better solutions; to help other staff develop as problem solvers	have, as reasons for involving others: to gather information; to increase ownership; to (less often) "bounce solutions"
6. **Knowledge**	list more crucial knowledges (e.g., of resources outside school, of self) and skills (of problem solving, of communication, of leadership)	regard, as crucial, knowledge of staff and their strengths and weaknesses, and "people skills"
	list more specific sources of knowledge (especially other principals' experiences and networks outside of school and system)	rely on smaller number of sources, often only staff in own school
7. **Experience as an Administrator**	report, as main change, more reflection on problem solving and a more refined, considered process	report, as main changes, more involvement of others in problem solving and more skill in accomplishing this
8. **Personal Values and Beliefs**	are better able to articulate values	are less able to articulate visions
	focus more on their own staff and "responsibilities"	do not appear to be aware of making decisions with reference to principles or values
9. **School System Context**	are more aware of needs and requirements of board as a whole	are less aware of system's needs and requirements
	are influenced, by board's encouragement, to act autonomously but with high performance expectations	
	value board for resources it provides to assist with school-level problem solving	
10. **Attitude Toward Problem Solving**	are definitely aware of problem solving as an activity	little sense of problem solving as an activity, and may even reject idea of "designed" problem-solving strategies
	enjoy new problems and see problems as opportunities	
	are confident, but realistic about inevitability of making some mistakes	

From: Leithwood and Stager, 1986

Some of the general characteristics that McCurdy (1983) identified with effective principals were a high level of academic achievement in college, a high degree of interpersonal skill, motivation for public service, intelligence, personal value orientations, tolerance for ambiguity, propensity to take risks, and willingness to consider alternative views.

Other researchers have identified the following personal traits or characteristics as typically found in effective principals:

- ☐ the ability to recognize patterns, perceptual objectivity, and analytical ability (Manasse, 1984);
- ☐ a sensitivity to the dynamics of power (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980);
- ☐ a tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980);
- ☐ a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980);
- ☐ openness to change (Huff et al., 1982);
- ☐ commitment to high standards (Huff et al., 1982); and
- ☐ the analytic and intellectual skills to guide the staff in the process of identifying and analyzing problems (Manasse, 1982).

Many of the personal attributes or characteristics mentioned above may not be something that can be taught or improved with staff development. It may be necessary to view these as desirable criteria -- as generic qualifications -- for consideration for administrative posts.

* * *

This section has presented the research on the competencies of effective administrators. The next section will include that and other research to categorize the competencies into the eight skill areas identified by the U.S. Department of Education's Leadership in Educational Administration (LEAD) program and a ninth category, parent and community involvement.

Section Three
Competencies of Effective Administrators

Barth (1986) contends that our public schools are being driven by a *list logic* concept of educational improvement. There are lists describing the characteristics of the *effective principal*, the *effective teacher*, the *effective school;* lists of minimum pupil competencies and of behavioral objectives for teachers; and lists of new certification requirements, mandates, and regulations. While Barth does not condone this proliferation of lists – and in fact offers an alternative to compiling yet more lists – he admits there is a compelling force to list logic. Lists provide a coherent nucleus around which to build a concept of the ideal; they often contain fresh thinking that widens the alternatives available for improvement; and each list usually attracts a band of believers who will take the next step and use the list to address real problems. Lists are defensible in presentations to school boards and state legislatures – lists promise change, legitimacy, and accountability to an enterprise in need of all three (Barth, 1986).

Section Three is not an attempt to add yet another list of competencies necessary for effective school administration. Rather, it is an attempt to make sense out of the lists that have already been compiled. This section of the document is a synthesis and discussion of the research on effective leadership using the U.S. Department of Education Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) program skill areas as an organizing format. This document is intended, in part, to serve as a product for the LEAD programs in the region served by SEDL. It is designed to provide those programs with research-based information on effective practices related to administrator leadership and the leadership skills associated with effective schools.

Categories of Skill Areas

The U.S. Department of Education's LEAD program identified eight skill areas as a focus for planning training programs to develop the competencies needed by effective school administrators. The eight LEAD skill areas include creating and enhancing school environments for learning and student achievement, evaluating school curricula to assess and improve effectiveness, analyzing instruction and teacher performance, appraising and assessing student performance and other indicators of school performance, understanding and applying research outcomes to school improvement, organizing and managing school resources, ensuring student discipline and a climate of order, and developing human resources. SEDL research indicates that an administrator's ability to work with parents toward school improvement is a significant factor in effective schools. For this reason, a ninth skill area has been added, involving parents and the community in school improvement. The fact that the categories have different amounts of space allocated to their discussion is not an indication of their relative importance, but rather an indication that research is more readily available for some categories.

Creating and Enhancing Environments for Learning

> *Elements of skill in this area include competence in assessing the school climate, setting clear goals for improvement, motivating staff and students to achieve those goals, and devising strategies of leadership for completing manageable activities with measurable outcomes of significance.*

The effective schools research indicates that the climate of a school is a determining factor in that school's success or failure as a place of learning (Purkey & Smith, 1982). The learning climate of a school is the product of the interaction between the organizational structure that surrounds the school and the roles, norms, and values demonstrated through the attitudes, behaviors, and communication patterns of the people involved (Purkey and Smith, 1982).

Sweeney (1983) pointed out that climate encompasses more than just the affective atmosphere of an organization. The climate of a school also includes (1) cohesiveness -- the degree to which the staff is able to work together to solve problems; (2) expectations -- the degree to which high expectations are communicated for both staff and students; (3) esprit -- the feeling of satisfaction and loyalty among the faculty; (4) goal orientation -- the sense of direction shared by the staff; and (5) leadership -- successfully getting everyone to work together toward the same goals.

The principal's contribution to the development of a school climate is made through a variety of actions that have a cumulative impact. Effective principals have a comprehensive understanding of the school and a clear vision of how the school should operate (Manasse, 1985). That vision serves as a guide to achieving a desired state; it is an image of a preferred condition that guides the school as it builds for the future (Sheive & Schoenheit, 1987a).

The importance of this personal vision of the school-as-a-whole is a recurring theme in studies of effective principals. Effective administrators make full use of symbol management to provide common direction and to tie the system together (Weick, 1982). The research on effective schools suggests that effective principals:

❑ have a vision of where the school is going based on values that can be, and are, publicly articulated and explained (Manasse, 1982);

❑ have a clear sense of mission and control (Huff et al., 1982);

❑ have strong feelings about the attainment of the system's purposes (Manasse, 1984);

❑ aggressively promote a point of view (Wellisch et al., 1978); and

❑ have the ability to transmit that vision of school goals to the staff and to engage the staff in the active achievement of those goals (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983).

Both vision and goal setting provide principals with a clear image of their schools and help them set priorities so they are not consumed by the organizational maintenance requirements of the job. Successful principals manage the goal-setting process, achieve consensus, and gain commitment from school staff (Manasse, 1985). They accomplish this by:

❑ using the goals as a continuous source of motivation (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980);

❑ engaging in deliberate administrative planning and action to ensure goal clarity and understanding (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983); and

- managing the goal-setting process to generate commitment to the vision on the part of all participants in the school community (Manasse, 1984).

According to Croghan and Lake (1984), the basic competencies necessary for the efficient running of the school -- competencies that all principals should exhibit -- include holding a set of values about the school (e.g., welfare of students, fairness to staff) and exhibiting behavior consistent with those values despite barriers. Every principal should:

- promote the welfare of the students;
- display a humane concern for the feelings of teachers, parents, and students;
- take difficult actions, which may be unpopular, when the welfare of students seems to be at stake; and
- emphasize the importance of fairness in providing opportunities, distributing priorities, administering discipline, and distributing funds.

The effective principal influences the overall instructional program and the specific learning objectives of students and staff by:

- using the status and power of the position to visibly support goals for the school's improvement program and directing the entire program of the school toward those goals (Odden, 1983);
- spearheading the development of an agenda of actions toward the implementation of the goals (Manasse, 1984);
- keeping the goals foremost, and integrating as many activities as possible toward those goals (Manasse, 1982);
- fostering cohesiveness and coherence in the school staff's pursuit of institutional goals (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983); and

- targeting everything about the school, including the organizational pattern and system of distributing resources, to support high performance and goal attainment (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983).

Principals of effective schools demonstrate their commitment to school goals by:

- providing clear, consistent, and well-communicated policy (McCurdy, 1983);
- encouraging in the staff a strong sense of participation and control over important educational decisions and activities in the school (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983);
- setting a good example by arriving early and working hard (McCurdy, 1983);
- participating directly in staff-development sessions, including making presentations (Odden, 1983); and
- sharing new ideas with teachers (McCurdy, 1983).

Evaluating Curricula to Improve Effectiveness

Elements of skill in this area include knowledge of content areas, understanding the structure of knowledge and the cognitive processes implicit in the curriculum, appraisal of implicit values and assumptions, and assessment of "curricular coherence" across grades and across subject areas with the goal of improvement.

Effective principals use instructional management strategies that promote and enhance effective teaching practices by working to develop an articulated school-wide curriculum that is coordinated across both grade levels and programs (Odden, 1983).

In a survey of 91 school districts (Martin, Saif, & Thiel, 1986-87), 89% of the curriculum directors or administrators responded that the primary responsibility for insuring that a new curriculum was implemented rested with the principal. When asked how they could tell whether a curriculum is being properly implemented, more than 70% of the districts reported that they relied on classroom observations by supervisors or principals -- a finding that supports the perception that principals are largely responsible for curriculum implementation (Martin, Saif, & Thiel, 1986-87).

Effective principals (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) ensure that scope and sequence exist and are adhered to. They demonstrate knowledge and interest in each curriculum. Ineffective principals (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) do not ensure that scope and sequence exist and are being adhered to for each curriculum and do not provide administrative support for curriculum problems.

Although the principal is seen by the central office as the one responsible for making sure that new curricular elements are implemented, few teachers report that they get much help in doing this from their principals. A 1984 survey (Kottkamp, Provenzo, & Cohn, 1986) of more than 2,700 Dade County, Florida, teachers was designed to provide data that could be compared to that collected in 1964 by Lortie (1975). When asked the sources from whom they received the most help with curriculum and methods, the teachers in 1984 indicated their greatest source of help was other teachers in the school (36%). Other major sources of help were the assistant principal for curriculum/curriculum assistant (22%), department or grade-level chairperson (12.5%), and resource teachers/subject-matter specialists (12.5%). The reliance on subject-matter specialists or resource teachers increased dramatically from 1964 when only 0.5% of the teachers reported getting the most help from that source. In spite of the increased emphasis on the principal as instructional leader, however, there was a decided decline in teachers' reporting the principal as the most help in those matters. Whereas in 1964, 9.4% of the teachers reported that the principal was the most help, in 1984, only 3.6% reported this.

Given this trend, it appears that other teachers and curriculum specialists are more effective facilitators of curricula and should, therefore, be included in the school leadership team to carry out this function.

Analyzing Instruction and Teacher Performance

> *Elements of skill in this area include ability to apply the research findings on effective teaching and classroom management to class and*

> *school settings, to use various methods of instructional observation and assessment, to model desirable techniques and behavior, and to use effective human relations approaches for motivating and leading faculty and students.*

The FCEM (Croghan & Lake, 1984) studies found that high-performing principals state high internal work standards, verbalize personal and group goals as a desire to do something better, provide better feedback on measures of how well self or group is doing, and show frustration in meeting barriers or in response to own or others' mistakes or failures. High performers also devise opportunities to receive adequate and timely feedback about the progress of others' work accomplishments, follow up on delegated activities, and provide plans for others about meeting standards of productivity.

Effective principals are committed to an active role in the management of instruction as well as the management of building, material, and financial resources (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983). They are able to engender in the faculty a high sense of responsibility for student achievement (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983) and maintain high visibility as instructional leaders by:

☐ emphasizing instruction (Brookover, et al., 1979);

☐ knowing the instructional issues, identifying the appropriate expertise and resources, providing necessary incentives, and orchestrating the processes for bringing resources to the staff and putting them to use (Manasse, 1982);

☐ initiating and participating in decisions about instructional programs and strategies (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983); and

☐ using staff meetings, staff development activities, and observation of and consultation with individual teachers as opportunities to encourage and recognize good work and show determination to remedy slack teaching (Duckworth, 1983).

Effective principals also function as the instructional leader of the school by using instructional management strategies that promote and enhance effective teaching practices, including working on such alterable variables as:

- ☐ time – fostering more for instruction, less for "instructions";
- ☐ class size and composition – assigning students to classrooms on the basis of what research indicates is the desired pupil composition for maximum learning; and
- ☐ organization – grouping teaching, programs and students in ways to shape positively the learning experience (Odden, 1983).

Effective principals reward and encourage teachers by providing time, materials, and assistance; juggling schedules to permit teachers to work together; arranging access to and credit for outside assistance; covering classes so that teachers could observe each other, plan together, or participate in training; offering informal and frequent pats on the back, praising teachers' accomplishments to others, and learning enough about what teachers are attempting to do in the classroom to serve as a fair, knowledgeable evaluator (Little, 1982).

The effective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) takes an active role in planning, conducting, implementing, and evaluating inservice training; provides direction and support for individual teachers to eliminate poor instructional performance; provides direct instructional leadership in one-to-one interactions with individual teachers; makes sure specifics of each teacher's classroom performance are evaluated; and hires an effective staff.

Principals exhibit ineffective behaviors (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) when they do not provide effective feedback on instructional skills; deny the importance of inservice programs; do not provide adequate classroom evaluation; hire teachers without an emphasis on teaching performance; and do not require teacher improvement.

Croghan and Lake (1984) found that among the basic or essential competencies of principals necessary for *adequate* performance was the ability of the principal to view developing others as a property of the principal's job. This is manifested when the principal:

- ☐ holds high expectations about the potential of other people to develop;

- works to help others do their job better and uses follow-up in order to develop others;
- gives support, approval or recognition for developmental activities of others; and
- instills a value of "developing others" in staff members.

McEvoy (1987) focused on principals' strategies in supporting their teachers' staff development and growth. Her findings indicate that principals influence the development of their staffs by: informing teachers of professional opportunities, disseminating professional and curricular materials, focusing staff attention on a specific theme, soliciting teachers' opinions, encouraging experimentation, and recognizing individual teachers' achievements. In all these strategies, the principal directs attention to individual teachers and personalizes the action. A follow-up intervention is the rule rather than the exception.

Effective principals provide a climate for the personal and professional growth of teachers (Persell, et al., 1982) when they:

- identify the strengths and potentials in staff in order to provide learning opportunities and developmental experience (Manasse, 1982);
- use constructive criticism to help teachers do a better job (McCurdy, 1983);
- communicate expectations through inservice training and frequent communications with teachers (Brookover, et al., 1979); and
- develop sanctions, supports and rewards for teacher improvement efforts (Odden, 1983).

Appraising Student Performance/School Performance

Student and school "performance" means more than just scholastic achievement. It also includes development of character and civic responsibility. Performance might be judged by factors other than achievement scores, including attainment and drop-out data, teacher

> *satisfaction and turnover, student discipline and behavior, community commitment and support, and the like. Elements of skill in this area include the ability to frame and interpret appropriate measures of performance and to stimulate enhanced performance.*

Effective principals have student expectations that are an essential aspect of the overarching goal and a source of influence on the nature of routine activities (Dwyer, 1984). They establish these expectations by:

- ☐ establishing academic standards and incentives for student learning (McCurdy, 1983);
- ☐ transmitting to the staff, and through staff to the students, that the school holds high performance expectations (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983); and
- ☐ developing school-wide incentives for academic accomplishment — honor roles, honor societies, award ceremonies, certificates of achievement, recognition through publications (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983).

The effective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) encourages students to pursue challenging academic goals, establishes school-wide academic requirements, expects counseling programs to challenge students, and sets instructional standards for teachers. Principals who exhibit ineffective behaviors minimize the importance of academic achievement in discussions with students, do not set specific goals for student performance, and allow students to get by with academic schedules that are not challenging (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

Effective principals (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) set up ongoing systems to provide recognition of academic success, make special efforts in addition to regular ongoing systems to give high quality recognition for academic achievement, encourage the use of standardized testing for student academic performance, and give personal recognition to individual students for their specific academic achievements. On the other hand, ineffective principals mishandle student recognition and ignore or misuse standardized tests (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

Understanding/Applying Research Outcomes

Administrators should be familiar with the processes of research, knowledgeable about the broad domains of research applicable to leadership and schooling, and they should be able to identify, understand, analyze, and apply the findings of research to the problems of school leadership and schooling.

Effective principals generally view teaching and school practices as open for scrutiny, discussion, analysis, and refinement by teachers and administrators. They do this by (Little, 1982):

- ☐ using portions of faculty meetings and lunch hours to talk about (and argue over) research findings and proposed program ideas and being willing to test ideas and methods that appeared promising;
- ☐ modeling participation in instructional improvement and organizing meeting agendas to reflect a commitment to effectiveness;
- ☐ reading and reporting on recent research; and
- ☐ joining teachers in studying, talking about, and planning for instructional improvements.

Effective principals demonstrate that they have and use the knowledge and skills needed for effective instruction, know thoroughly the effective teaching research, and are involved with teachers in infusing practices into the classroom (Odden, 1983). In addition, they transmit clear expectations for all staff to be knowledgeable about effective instruction and to be participants, independently and with colleagues, in efforts to improve the quality of instruction (Little, 1982).

Organizing/Managing School Resources

It is the effective administrator's responsibility to marshal resources and make them available when and where needed, to facilitate the teachers's job by removing unnecessary obstacles and burdens, to anticipate and identify problems and provide for their resolution, and to create an organizational environment free of distortions of communication and supported by clear

> *job functions and sound office routines. Administrative competence in these areas is built upon skills in communication, problem solving, time management, budgeting, work flow, human relations, and a variety of other related functions.*

Effective principal behavior (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) is that which supports teacher decisions and needs with action and provides the atmosphere and resources to complete staff instructional tasks. On the other hand, the ineffective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) denies teachers supplies and resources through misadministration, displays a lack of confidence and respect for teachers, and makes unreasonable demands on teachers outside of teaching responsibilities.

As part of a study (Pfeifer, 1986) of the sources of teacher effectiveness and job satisfaction, a research team from Stanford University interviewed 85 classroom teachers in five districts in the San Francisco Bay area. The study focused on organizational factors that support or detract from teacher effectiveness -- specifically, principal strategies that influence the classroom and the school. Principals seen as effective by these teachers first attended to the everyday realities of organizational life in schools -- minimized interruptions and excessive paperwork, insured the availability of adequate instructional materials; provided appropriate training; and fostered positive, supportive human relationships throughout the school (Pfeifer, 1986). Effective leadership entailed making the bureaucracy work by constructing an environment that minimized uncertainty and assured emotional support for teachers. Teachers viewed the principal's role as one of *enabling* effective instruction by teachers (Pfeifer, 1986).

Effective principals protect teachers from a variety of strains and pressures, internal and external (Little, 1982), and sustain overall school effectiveness by:

- ☐ reducing the number of non-instructional interruptions that teachers experience in their classrooms — such as collecting lunch money, listening to announcements over the P.A. system, excessive paper work, etc. (Bossert, et al., 1982; Hargrove, et al., 1981), and

- ☐ providing materials and resources -- indeed, testing the limits in providing needed resources (Huff, et al, 1982) -- and insuring support for special projects (Bossert, et al., 1982).

The FCEM studies (Croghan & Lake, 1984) found that high-performing principals set plans and programs to accomplish goals. They scheduled activities and the use of human and other resources for accomplishing goals by focusing on time, deadlines, flow of activities or resources, and on ways to get the job done. They are able to:

- ☐ make schedules and budget their own time;
- ☐ show a concern for time and schedule;
- ☐ review a task and then plan (e.g., review all items on desk and then proceed with a plan and schedule, using this style in work or simulation situations);
- ☐ establish priorities, handle important issues first and allocate more time to high-priority issues;
- ☐ organize the activities of a group in order to develop a logical plan for what will be done first, second, and so forth, for meetings and other points of communication.

Effective principals build a mental image of the entire school based on frequent exposure to the events and people in it, and use that reservoir of knowledge about the school, its customs, and people to solve specific problems and take initiative (Morris, et al., 1981). They do this by:

- ☐ being in charge of their jobs (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980);
- ☐ putting in extraordinary amounts of time to achieve their purposes (Manasse, 1984);
- ☐ delegating routine paper work (Brookover, 1979);
- ☐ actively exploiting the resources of their positions and seizing the initiative (Little, 1982);
- ☐ developing agendas, monitoring programs and behavior, and providing feedback (Manasse, 1984); and

☐ using their analytic and intellectual skills to guide the staff in the process of identifying and analyzing problems (Manasse, 1982).

High-performing principals are able to clearly present their own ideas and others' ideas and information in an open and genuine way; are able to share ideas with others in an open, informative, non-evaluative manner; and effectively use technical, symbolic, non-verbal, and visual aids or graphics in order to get the message across (Croghan & Lake, 1984). However, according to Croghan and Lake (1984), all principals should have a set of basic competencies that includes the ability to delegate authority and responsibility clearly and appropriately in accomplishing organizational goals. Such things as delegating a project not currently a routine part of the person's job (e.g., gathering information, developing a proposal or a plan, implementing a project) should be differentiated from the normal assignment of tasks that people routinely do.

The effective principal also has the political and managerial skills necessary to resolve conflict and make the planning process work (Manasse, 1982), often testing the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980).

Ensuring Discipline and School Order

> *The administrator's responsibility includes the important tasks of setting and enforcing standards for student behavior and of creating a climate of respect and order in the school. Elements of administrative skill in this area include ability to apply pertinent research, ability to model and communicate expected behavior, familiarity with model codes and school routines, and human-relations skills.*

Effective principals recognize that school climate is made up of diverse actions that communicate to students that the school is a pleasant place to be, can help them achieve, and is a serious work place (Dwyer, 1984). Principals seek to maintain order in the school building and simultaneously enhance the school's atmosphere for learning (Morris, et al, 1981) by:

☐ setting a tone of respect for teachers and students (Persell, et al., 1983);

☐ setting the tone of the school as an orderly, purposeful, organized, relatively quiet, and pleasant place to be (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983);

☐ creating a system for administering discipline in the school (Morris, et al., 1981);

☐ ensuring that teachers and students have clear guidelines concerning the school's rules and policies on promotion, homework, absenteeism, tardiness, and grading (McCurdy, 1983);

☐ encouraging teachers to use positive rather than negative reinforcement with students (Brookover, et al., 1979); and

☐ providing discipline that is perceived by students and teachers alike as fair — giving out both punishments and rewards in an even-handed fashion (Safe Schools, Vol. 1, 1978).

Most importantly, principals of effective schools spend a large percentage of their time on instructional and disciplinary matters in the school (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983). They anticipate crises and problems, often by being on the go and visibly in charge at times and places of potential disorder, and by heading off complications before they develop. They are visibly present in corridors, classrooms, washrooms, stairwells, and throughout the building (Dwyer, 1984; Morris, et al., 1981) – a definite presence within the school — a concrete representation of the authority behind the rules and norms (Morris, et al., 1981).

An effective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) enforces discipline personally with students, establishes and enforces a clear code of conduct regarding rules such as attendance and absence policies, provides support and back-up for enforcement of discipline, and assigns staff and resources to confront violation of established rules. On the other hand, an ineffective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) permits student behavior that creates disorderly environment and disrupts classroom time, enforces discipline in a weak or inappropriate manner, does not establish and enforce a clear code of conduct including attendance and absence policies, and avoids enforcement of discipline and promotion of a studious atmosphere.

Developing Human-Relation Skills

> ***These skills are, in part, those through which the effective administrator attracts competent staff and elicits from them their best efforts, and they are those through which the administrator establishes a climate of interpersonal interaction based on respect and conducive to productive work habits and personal well-being.***

The effective principal has a sound knowledge of his or her own personal leadership style and personal strengths and weaknesses (Manasse, 1984), a sensitivity to the dynamics of power (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980), and a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980). He or she fosters open, accepting, honest

Effective principals establish a climate in which staff has a high level of satisfaction with their work and encourage a strong sense of participation and control over important educational decisions and activities in the school (MacPhail-Wilson, 1983). Most effective principals accomplish this by:

- using a participatory style of leadership (Huff, et al., 1982);
- exhibiting an open, professional, and collegial style that fosters joint discussion, evaluation, and improvement (Darling-Hammond, 1985; Hargrove, et al., 1981; Odden, 1983); and
- working with others by appealing to the perspectives and incentives of those they would persuade (Hargrove, et al., 1981).

The effective principal intuitively applies theories that see leadership as systems of individuals and resources and recognizes appropriate substitutes for direct leadership (Kerr, 1976). They are able to identify individuals to support and complement their own abilities (Manasse, 1984) and ensure that someone in the organization fulfills the following functions:

- implements programs of known effectiveness or is active in curricular improvement,
- monitors teacher performance,

- provides concrete technical assistance to teachers (inservice programs, coaching),
- demonstrates visible commitment to programs for instructional improvement, and
- provides emotional support and incentives for teachers (Gersten and Carnine, 1981).

Croghan and Lake (1984) found that high-performing principals have the ability to persuade or influence others through a number of possible means: gaining and sustaining attention and interest in a group situation, using information or arguments, modeling the behaviors expected, or being direct in specifying what others will do. The high-performing principal not only is sensitive to the ideas and opinions of others but also:

- discovers, understands, and verbalizes the concepts, thoughts, and ideas held by others;
- uses probing repetition to have others describe their own perspectives, ideas, and feelings;
- discovers and understands the ideas and concepts of others from their point of view; and
- uses summary, clarification, and paraphrasing to test the accuracy of a conception of another's perspective (e.g., of a teacher, a student).
- monitors teacher performance,

- provides concrete technical assistance to teachers (inservice programs, coaching),
- demonstrates visible commitment to programs for instructional improvement, and
- provides emotional support and incentives for teachers (Gersten and Carnine, 1981).

The FCEM studies (Croghan & Lake, 1984) also found that high-performing principals are able to get others to interact, to stimulate others to work together, to understand each other, to resolve conflict or agree to its presence, and to encourage others to reach mutual agreement. They also use their own and others' ideas to initiate and stimulate dialogue between others and demonstrate good group-process and facilitator skills.

The effective principal (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985) listens actively to staff and faculty ideas and creates opportunities for staff to express ideas, provides resources and a supportive environment for collaborative planning, establishes school-wide goals and programs through staff input and participation, and appoints committees with representatives from all sides. Principals whose behaviors are ineffective avoid staff involvement in decisions or discussions, provide little or no feedback after meetings, and do not provide resources or support for collaborative planning (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

Effective principals go out of their way to help teachers solve problems and to look out for the personal welfare of teachers by doing them personal favors, staying after school to help with extra work, and providing necessary services (McCurdy, 1983).

Involving Parents and the Community

This ninth competency has been included because it has become increasingly clear that educators by themselves cannot accomplish the reforms necessary to improve schools and education. There is a need for resources beyond those that educators have traditionally employed (Chavkin & Williams, 1985).

Effective principals are able to expand the resources available to their schools by involving parents and members of the community (Morris, et al., 1981). These principals obtain active parental involvement in school activities; communicate personally with parents of individual students; inform parents of special programs and activities; interact directly with parents and citizens to promote the school; and establish direct personal contact between parents and teachers (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985). Principals exhibit ineffective behaviors when they avoid interpersonal communication with parents; communicate in a manner that will make parents angry or feel negative toward the school; discourage parental involvement; succumb to nonacademic special interest groups; and do not meet with parents on positive topics (Russell, Mazzarella, White, & Maurer, 1985).

SEDL's Parent Involvement in Education Project (PIEP) conducted a comprehensive six-year study of attitudes and practices of teacher educators, teachers, principals, parents, and school administrators regarding parent involvement in the Southwestern Region served by SEDL. PIEP translated the research findings from this study into practice-based recommendations for key stakeholders in parent involvement (Chavkin & Williams, 1985). A review and analysis of results from the surveys can be obtained from SEDL.

The following list contains those actions that effective administrators can take to insure that parent involvement works for their schools or districts:

1. There are written policies at the district and building levels to establish parent involvement's legitimacy and a framework is in place for developing as well as implementing such policies.
2. Formal declarations are made by local district officials regarding the need and importance of parent involvement.
3. A working definition for parent involvement is derived from a consensus of parents and educators.
4. Parents are viewed and valued as partners in the education of children.
5. Parent knowledge, skill, interest, time available, and exper-ience levels are the basis of parent involvement efforts.
6. Parent involvement training is provided for parents and educators.
7. Parents participate in "traditional" (supportive) ways aswell as "non-traditional" (governance) ways.
8. Teachers/principals have guidelines for involving parents in children's education at school and at home.
9. Parents are informed about children's learning success as well as those areas needing improvement.

10. Parents are given ideas about how to become more involved in children's learning and are asked about how they would like to become involved in schools, classrooms, etc.

11. Informal opportunities are made available for parents, teachers, and principals to share or interact about children as well as school.

12. Opportunities are available for parents and teachers to take part in staff development/inservice education activities together.

13. Parents are made to feel more welcome in and more like "co-owners" of schools.

14. Parent involvement opportunities are made available which must be satisfied in schools rather than on ways in which the principal can incorporate all of those functions into his or her own behavior.

15. Parent involvement activities are developed around parent interests, skills, experiences, and time available.

16. Parent involvement training is provided for prospective teachers and administrators.

17. Parent involvement efforts are coordinated and conducted in collaboration with other community or neighborhood school participation.

18. Written documentation is kept regarding the development, implementation, and assessment of parent involvement efforts.

19. Regular communication is maintained between home and school regarding children and related or relevant school matters.

* * *

This section has used the skill areas defined by the LEAD program to organize and present the research findings on the competencies of effective administrators. Section Four of this document discusses the concept of *leadership* in an attempt to uncover some feasible patterns of behavior that might allow an administrator to meet the many and varied expectations generated by the effective school research.

Section Four

Providing Leadership for Change

This section examines the superordinate characteristic called *leadership* and offers suggestions on how administrators can ensure that the functions of leadership are present in their schools or school districts. Although most of the research literature to date has concentrated on the leadership qualities of effective *principals*, the qualities that define effective principal leadership should also be applicable for administrators at every level. And, a point made very strongly by those who have studied effective schools, leadership functions work best for school improvement when they are shared with school staff.

Leadership: A Prerequisite for Effectiveness

Definitions of the Terms "Manager" and "Leader"

Many views of the role of principal have been discussed in the literature including conceptions of the principal as manager, instructional leader, administrative decision maker, organizational change agent, and conflict manager (Greenfield, 1982). There is an on-going controversy over whether the principal should function primarily as an instructional leader or as an administrative manager or attempt to somehow effectively incorporate the functions of both. Although the conditions of the workplace dictate that school administrators concentrate their energies on managerial functions, the educational literature presents strong expectations for school administrators to perform as leaders.

The concepts of *leadership* and *management* are sometimes confused in the literature. However, a clear distinction has been made by many researchers. *Management* is "composed of those activities concerned with procuring, coordinating, and deploying materiel and the personnel needed to accomplish the goals of the organization" (Ubben & Hughes, 1987, p.6). It involves the allocation of financial and other resources; the planning and implementing of organizational features; and the provision of actions, arrangements, and activities needed for the school to reach its goals (Sergiovanni, 1987b).

Burns (1978) distinguishes between managers, as *transactors*, and leaders, as *transformers*. The manager negotiates fair exchanges or transactions with employees, providing rewards or punishment in exchange for their efforts. The *leader*, on the other hand, *transforms* the organization according to a vision of where it should be moving (Sashkin, 1987). Most of the effective schools research appears to have used the term *leadership* in this way. Leadership is "the quality that enables an individual within a given setting to motivate and inspire others to adopt, achieve, and maintain organizational and individual goals" (Guthrie & Reed, 1986, p. 199). Leadership entails defining the mission and purpose of the school, identifying and setting goals, marshaling and directing human resources, solving problems and making decisions creatively, and motivating staff (Sergiovanni, 1987b). Ubben and Hughes (1987, p. 6) summarize the quality of leadership as "the result of the way principals use themselves to create a school climate characterized by staff productivity, student productivity, and creative thought."

A fruitful way to think about leadership is as a set of behaviors or activities. Unlike position-based concepts, this definition allows for the possibilities that (1) those not officially in *leader* positions may exhibit leadership behaviors, (2) only a fraction of a leader's work may actually involve leadership activities, and (3) there are individuals who may master all the necessary operations in a training program — from planning to decision making — but are not able to actually incorporate such leadership behaviors into their repertoire (Duke, 1986).

Administrators may engage in many activities, but without *leadership* their actions may not convey meaning to those around them. The following is a synthesis of the behaviors through which, according to Duke (1986), a leader provides meaning:

> **Direction.** In the presence of leadership a person senses direction. Direction is more than a course to follow. It is a path together with a reason for traveling it. Direction presumes meaning.
>
> **Engagement.** Where there are people there are feelings, thoughts, and aspirations. Leadership is distinguishable from management, in part, because of the extent to which it is capable of engaging these feelings, thoughts, and aspirations.

Fit. To some extent such properties as direction and engagement are dependent on the relationship between leaders and their times. No leader fully controls such a relationship. A continuing interaction takes place between leaders, their followers, and the culture in which they exist.

Originality. Originality refers to the capacity of a leader to capture the imagination through uniqueness — in ideas, behavior, programs, and so on. Leadership, almost by nature, defies generalizability and predictability.

Dramatics. Leadership is a realm of ritual, ceremony, and dramatic performance. Leaders speak of feeling as if they were always *on stage*. Memorable performances by leaders help overcome the problem of public recognition and serve to evoke the feelings that are necessary for action.

Design. Leadership is not only dramatic performance. It also entails the transformation of vision into reality. This process is essentially creative.

Orchestration. Leaders frequently are called upon to bring together individuals for the sake of accomplishing goals. When they are successful in coordinating the energies of an assortment of people with different abilities, their efforts can be likened to those of a gifted conductor blending together elements of sound to produce an integrated piece of music.

Although good managers are not necessarily good leaders, good leaders must be good managers. They are able to transform their schools only because they manage the mundane activities that keep the school functioning smoothly (Sashkin, 1987). The research shows that in addition to being accomplished administrators who develop and implement sound policies, procedures, and practices, effective administrators are also leaders who shape the school's culture by creating and articulating a vision, winning support for it, and inspiring others to attain it.

Instructional Leadership Revisited

An effective principal has always been expected to keep a school running smoothly; now, the principal is also expected to spend more time as an instructional leader — visiting classrooms and working with teachers. While school principals must, of necessity, attend to the organizational maintenance tasks inherent in managing any organization, research suggests that principals who place a strong emphasis on the improvement of instruction influence the achievement of children in a positive way (Greenfield, 1982). The American Association of School Administrator's *The Role of the Principal in Effective Schools* (McCurdy, 1983), states that *instructional leadership* is the main ingredient in good schools and the principal is the individual who must initiate that leadership. The concept — instructional leader — is defined as leadership toward educational achievement. This is achieved by making instructional quality the top priority of the school. Unfortunately, the reality of the principalship and the organizational structure within which principals function makes this difficult to accomplish.

Administrators whose days are occupied with putting out brush fires, handling exceptions, resolving disputes, and coming up with all the answers, neither have the time to develop an adequate vision of what the school should become nor time to perform all the functions required of an instructional leader (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

Time Constraints and Instructional Leadership

The difficulty of finding many principals with the vision, creativity, or sheer energy to fulfill the expectations set by the research is illustrated by the studies of the daily work pattern of principals. Three properties have been defined that appear common to all principals' work: principals appear to be occupied by tasks that are characterized by brevity, variety, and fragmentation (Peterson, 1984b).

According to Crowson and Porter-Gehrie (1980), school principals are the most accessible and vulnerable representatives of school administration in a system. The researchers found that time is a scarce resource for the principal — a resource that must be shared with a variety of persons. In communications with various individuals, principals frequently receive problems and requests that few others can solve. As line supervisors, principals must be available to explain and implement school policy, resolve conflict between clients and system employees, and alter the schools operation to address specific situations that develop. In addition, principals must balance their role of educational leader against demands for paperwork required by monitoring systems of the central office, the State Department of Education, or by federal regulations (Crowson & Porter-Gehrie, 1980).

Complexity of Role

This description of the complexity of the principal's role was affirmed by urban high-school and middle-school principals who met in March 1985 under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation (*Carnegie Quarterly*, 1986). The principals were invited to participate in a conference on the role of the principal in urban schools. The group represented a diverse array of city schools serving minority or racially mixed, disadvantaged communities across the nation. All the participants were known to be among the most innovative and dedicated school principals in the country (*Carnegie Quarterly*, 1986). The following is a summary of some of the points made by the participants (*Carnegie Quarterly*, 1986):

> **The Multifaceted Mission of Principals:** Urban school principals, like their schools, have a multifaceted mission. As one principal remarked, "The job description says you are an instructional leader, but there are a thousand and one things that interfere. I can't handle all the problems that arise and be an instructional leader. I'm not in control of my agenda."
>
> **Lack of Time for Reflection:** In juggling the multiple demands made on them daily, principals rarely have time to reflect on the need for systemic changes in their schools.
>
> **The Need for Collegial Interaction:** The strain of coping is aggravated by the sense of isolation that urban school principals feel.
>
> **The Need for Central Office Support:** Lack of support from their own central offices is a major problem for principals. Sometimes, the central office sets up a competitiveness among schools that is destructive to a sharing of ideas within a district. The central office "exercises too much petty control over budgetary and other matters."
>
> **The Need for Training:** Participants urged that principals' training include coursework on innovation and organizational change, giving future leaders a sense of how to use human and material resources in the innovation process and how to assess the sources of support and resistance to change.

Principals' Perceptions of Their Roles

As noted above, although instructional leadership has been identified as characteristic of principals of effective schools, managing the school organization and juggling a broad range of administrative details appears to be a more accurate description of what *most* principals actually do (Crowson & Porter-Gehrie, 1980; Martin & Willower, 1981). Most of the attention of most principals is given to organizational maintenance tasks (Greenfield, 1982). Consequently, the principalship tends to be defined by incumbents more often in terms of administrative behavior than in terms of instructional functions, and attempts by the principal to act as a change agent or instructional leader are increasingly in conflict with overwhelming pressures to be a *production manager* (Salley, McPherson, & Baehr, 1979).

Stronge and McVeain (1986) sought to answer the question, "Are principals functioning predominantly as head teachers or as middle managers?" They studied principals' perceptions of their major job responsibilities and how the principals allocated their on-the-job time. The researchers found that *school management* was the primary focus of both elementary and secondary principals, with a majority of the time spent on managing the school. The researchers presented compelling evidence that principals do not perceive that they are filling the role of instructional leader. In recent years the amount of time principals have been able to commit to direct instructional leadership appears to have been limited by the assumption of increasingly complex and varied management responsibilities. This study provides no indication that the diverse role of the building principal will change in the foreseeable future.

In another study (Brubaker & Simon, 1987), 370 North Carolina principals representing 94 of the 140 systems in the state were surveyed concerning their views on the questions:

> What is your present leadership role?
>
> What leadership role would you like to have?
>
> What leadership role do most principals in North Carolina play?

Each question was directed toward five roles principals have traditionally played: *Principal/Teacher, General Manager, Professional and Scientific Manager, Administrator and Instructional Leader*, and *Curriculum Leader*. The results of the survey (Brubaker & Simon, 1987) showed that 71% viewed their own leadership role as *Administrator and Instructional Leader* – a distant second was *General Manager*. However, 60% of the respondents categorized "most North Carolina principals" as *General Managers*. Although these findings appear to be contradictory, Brubaker and Simon (1987) suggest that principals have been told in no uncertain terms that they are supposed to be instructional leaders and to admit that they are not is to risk censure. It is relatively safe, however, to say that *other* principals are *General Managers*, who, in the words of one respondent, spend most of their time putting out fires.

Blank (1986) studied leadership variables related to the *educator role* and the *administrator role* of the principal. The findings tend to support the common view that high school principals have little time to spend as educational leaders of their schools because they must devote so much attention to managing the school (Blank, 1986). The results of the study indicated that principals of comprehensive high schools provided less leadership in educational areas than in administrative areas. The characteristic of principal leadership that was most consistently found in this sample was the principal acting in a support role. A majority of the principals provided only low or moderate leadership activity in areas related to curriculum and instruction.

Providing School Leadership

Rallis and Highsmith (1986) point out that acquiring or developing leadership within a school — specifically instructional leadership — requires more than simply exhorting principals to be strong and to go forth and lead. School leadership is complicated by the loosely coupled nature of schools. Such loosely coupled systems require leaders who have both the ability and the freedom to manipulate the components of change. A principal has more than enough duties to keep busy with management tasks alone. Time not spent coordinating activities, handling crises, or dealing with parents and the community is eaten up by paperwork (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986). The provision of leadership for change is a responsibility that should be shared by a community of people both within and outside the school. While principals initiate, encourage, and facilitate instructional improvement to the extent allowed by their own abilities, styles, and circumstances, they still need help from others if improvement is to become the norm (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

Facilitating the Functions of School Leadership

Many researchers (DeBevoise, 1984; Hall et al., 1983) suggest that, while the principal has some rights of initiative that others do not have, instructional leadership and the facilitation of change should not be the responsibility of just the principal. Research studies have found that most principals do not exercise *instructional* leadership alone; that such leadership is often the collective task of the principal and other members of the organization (DeBevoise, 1984; Gersten & Carnine, 1981; Hall, et al., 1983). This has led to an increasing focus in the research on the common leadership functions that must be satisfied in schools rather than on ways in which the principal can incorporate all of those functions into his or her own behavior.

Support Functions. Gersten and Carnine (1981) have identified six administrative and supervisory support functions that they consider essential to instructional improvement. They do not believe, however, that these functions need necessarily be carried out by the principal. Their work with Follow Through in inner-city schools revealed that the principal may not play a central role in increasing the instructional effectiveness of schools. They argue that most principals either are not trained to be instructional leaders or have too many other demands placed on their time. The principal's role, then, is to ensure that someone in the organization fulfills the following support functions (Gersten & Carnine, 1981):

- ☐ implement programs of known effectiveness or be actively involved in curricular improvement;
- ☐ monitor student performance;
- ☐ monitor teacher performance;
- ☐ demonstrate visible commitment to programs for instructional improvement; and
- ☐ provide emotional support and incentives for teachers.

Principal as Facilitator of Change. The most effective role for principals may be that of facilitator or coordinator of change rather than direct leader (Manasse, 1985). Rallis and Highsmith (1986) suggest that school management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed by a single individual. A different form of leadership is essential, and a fundamental reorientation in the way school leadership is perceived is needed. Shared responsibility and control should take the place of the individual hero carrying the burdens alone.

Such a shared approach was observed in the case studies conducted by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) and by Bossert and others (1982), although the degree to which a team was used varied widely, depending on the principal's leadership style. Stringfield and Teddlie (1987, p. 8) found "effective or improving schools in which the actual instructional leader was not the principal but a faculty member or informal leadership team." Typically, in addition to the principal, members of such a leadership team have included a vice principal, a resource teacher, a department head, a facilitator, or a curriculum specialist from the district office (Hord, Stiegelbauer, and Hall, 1984).

In fact, from their research on the change process in schools, Hord and Hall (1987) discovered that there often was a Second Change Facilitator (Second CF) who assisted the change process. In a comparison of what Second CFs did in relation to what the principals did, Hord and Hall found that the Second CF played a complementary role to that of the principal. When principals did less, Second CFs took more action. These Second CFs made significant contributions by helping teachers change their practices. It appears that, while principals are in a special position to exert more influence by their actions, others in the school often play vital roles as parts of a leadership team with the principal.

A delicate balance is required of principals in their role of promoting change and facilitating the work of teachers. On the one hand, as specifically suggested by Miles (1983), administrative commitment that leads to administrative pressure on users to implement change, along with administrative support and assistance to users, is a critical factor in bringing about school change. Fullan and Park (1981) also affirm the necessity of pressure as a prelude to realizing significant change. It might be more fruitful, however, to interpret *administrative pressure* in the light of Darling-Hammond's (1985) view that providing opportunities for the professional leadership activities of teachers and for the development of collegial, equitable interrelationships between the school's administrators and its teachers is a more productive approach to achieving change. From this perspective administrative pressure would be interpreted to mean *administrative encouragement and facilitation.* "Maintaining the delicate yet crucial balance between the humanitarian concerns of supportive behaviors and the pragmatic dictates of responsible authority could be fairly said to constitute the fundamental, practical problem of change management" (Hord, 1987, p. 81).

At the same time that the effective schools movement has been calling for principals to become strong instructional leaders, teachers have been seeking a stronger voice in regulating and developing their own profession. Teachers at the National Teachers' Forum sponsored by the Education Commission of the States (reported in *Education USA*, March 17, 1986) insisted that if school-level reform is to be achieved, teachers must be given both the power and the time to take part in key decisions. Indeed, teachers not only recognize the need for instructional leadership, they also are beginning to demand that it come from teaching professionals, not only from administrators. Thus we have three problems: (1) schools need leadership for change that will insure substantive and lasting school improvement efforts; (2) principals' time is consumed by management tasks; and (3) teachers want to improve their professional skills and they want the leadership for this to come from within their own ranks (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

Involving Others in Decision Making and Problem Solving

It is important to recognize that effective leadership includes the ability to motivate others to change or improve and to gain their commitment to organization goals. Part of the solution to the problems of initiating change, motivating teachers, and gaining faculty commitment, as well as to the problems of providing instructional leadership, lies in involving the faculty in making many of the decisions that have a direct impact on their work (Duttweiler, 1986). A number of researchers have come to this conclusion. Stallings and Mohlman (1981) found that in schools where students, teachers, and administrators reviewed school policies and rules and decided collectively on revisions, teacher morale was higher and teachers were more committed to teaching. In a study on teacher involvement in decision making, Schneider (1984) also found that those teachers who perceived they had a high involvement in making decisions had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than those teachers who perceived their involvement at lower levels. Hargrove and his associates (1981) concluded that successful principals followed a leadership style that involved their faculties in school decision-making processes and encouraged genuine exchange among teachers. Based on evidence from his and other's research, Lortie (1986) contends that when teachers perceive there is a genuine potential for participation in important school-level decisions they are more likely to expend the extra effort required and gain a greater degree of satisfaction.

In general, the literature indicates that principals of effective schools establish decision-making partnerships with their staffs. They use a participatory style of leadership (Huff, Lake, & Schaalman, 1982); they respect teachers and collaborate in making rules (McCurdy, 1983); they facilitate collegiality among teachers (Hargrove et al., 1981); they encourage in their staffs a strong sense of participation and control over important educational decisions and activities in the school (MacPhail-Wilson & Guth, 1983); and they exhibit an open, professional, and collegial style that fosters joint discussion, evaluation, and improvement (Odden, 1983).

The implications of this research is nicely recapped by Guthrie and Reed (1986). They suggest that participation in organizational decision making by individuals who will be affected by the decision and who are knowledgeable about the area in which a decision is to be made has several advantages:

1. Participation in decision-making is valued when groups or individuals believe there is potential for real influence, and not merely token or passive involvement.
2. Where there is group participation, feelings of satisfaction are enhanced, creativity is encouraged, and participants' acceptance and commitment to the decision is strengthened.
3. The quality of the decision also may be improved by the larger numbers of alternatives that can be generated and analyzed.

Problems in Developing Shared Leadership

Although the research suggests that shared decision making is a real factor in teacher satisfaction and in school effectiveness, it is not a widespread phenomenon. For example, according to a California survey (Koppich, Gerritz, & Guthrie, 1985):

- ☐ while 90% of the California teachers polled thought they should have the right to participate in decisions about what should be taught in their schools, only 41% actually had the opportunity to do so;

- ☐ although 98% felt that teachers should work with administrators in setting the school's discipline policy, only 42% reported being involved;
- ☐ where 98% would like a voice in making teaching assignments, less than half (42%) said this was true in their districts;
- ☐ even though 84% believed teachers should have some say in assigning students to classes, only 28% did; and
- ☐ while 78% thought teachers should be included in the selection of new teachers to their schools, just 15% had the opportunity to do so.

A major problem with giving teachers any part in the school decision-making process is the resistance of school administrators to sharing their control. In their research on principals' coping mechanisms, Crowson and Porter-Gehrie (1980) found a tendency for principals to be wary of any reduction of control over the work environment. Principals (both high school and elementary) appeared to delegate very little responsibility to subordinates. Given the ever-present potential for crises, accidents, mix-ups, and disturbances, many principals seemed to be most reluctant to trust others with decision prerogatives.

In an effort to protect administrator *turf*, the American Federation of School Administrators (*Education USA*, April 6, 1987) has charged that the American Federation of Teachers has repeatedly attempted to appropriate for teachers the work customarily performed by administrators. *Education USA* (April, 6, 1987, p. 237) quotes an AFSA communication as saying, "Use of teachers as lead teachers, master teachers, and teacher mentors . . . is merely a guise for the realignment of the established work relationship between AFSA and AFT." This is undoubtedly true. And, just such a realignment is what most educational reformers are calling for.

In California, where a *mentor teacher* program was adopted by the legislature in 1982 to develop an elite teaching corps to help and guide new teachers, the problem in many districts has been with administrators and teachers learning how to make such an unprecedented program work. "There's never been a leadership position of this kind for teachers. It calls for basic reforms in the teaching occupation and school organization," according to Tom Bird, co-author of a study by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (*Education USA,* January 20, 1986).

Dal Lawrence (1985), President of the Toledo Federation of Teachers, pointed out that the Toledo teacher intervention and intern programs were met with apprehension by many school principals and supervisors. The programs launched a reform of teacher evaluation and professional development that altered the accepted assumptions about how teachers should relate to school management within the traditional public school structure. Responsibilities were realigned -- a realignment that remained in contention by principals and supervisors for years. Now in its fifth year, the Toledo Plan enjoys the staunch support of 99% of its administrators. Administrators are convinced that it is a success with teachers. As a result, leaders of the principals' union are working with top Toledo administrators to develop a similar program for building-level managers (McCormick, 1985).

Administrators of effective schools do not seem to share the fears of their more bureaucratically bound brethren. The Heritage Foundation studied the principals of 65 of the secondary schools honored by the U.S. Department of Education in 1983 for excellence in education. The survey asked the principals what *leadership factors* they considered the most critical in running their schools effectively. Topping the list -- mentioned by 80% of the principals -- was faculty participation in decision making. As one principal noted, collective decision making takes longer, but the resulting decisions tend to stand firmer, last longer, and gain greater acceptance (cited in *The Executive Educator*, 1984, pp. 6-7). People who solve problems build a sense of commitment to and concern for the organization. If people have invested in decisions, they have a stake in seeing solutions work; conversely, uninvolved people may have a stake in seeing solutions fail. Participatory management patterns -- talking to, listening to, and involving people -- not only tap the resources of personnel to solve specific problems, but engage their willing cooperation and commitment (ASCD, 1985).

The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987) recognized that the recommendations contained in its report call for a dramatic change in the shape of the schools, the relationship among leaders and administrators, the preparation of educational administrators, and their work. The Commission supported the new roles for teachers proposed by the Holmes and Carnegie reports and suggested that changes will be required in the way schools actually operate so that teachers will play significant roles in helping to formulate and implement educational policies affecting the instructional program. The Commission recommended that schools foster collegiality so that teachers and administrators share in planning, implementation, evaluation, and learning together.

Developing the Capacities of School Staff to Participate in Leadership Teams

Bradford and Cohen (1984) have asserted that an administrator, to achieve excellence, must first believe in the concept of shared responsibility and control and then create a team of school staff members who are jointly responsible with the administrator for the school's success. The administrator works to foster professional responsibility in the staff as he or she helps to develop staff abilities to share in the management of the school. Only when all staff members are committed to joint responsibility for overall excellence will the functions of instructional leadership be carried out effectively and school improvement efforts be successful.

If school staff members are not encouraged to understand the wide organizational perspective, are not included in key meetings and issues, and are not given some overall responsibility, opportunities to expand and use their abilities are lost (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). At the same time, only when staff become skilled in the managerial tasks required for school success and share in the responsibility for that success can the school achieve excellence. Since neither the willingness to accept overall responsibility nor the ability to do so are automatic and instant, Bradford and Cohen (1984) have suggested the *Manager-as-Developer Model* for developing staff to share in the responsibilities of leadership. Skills have to be learned, common goals accepted, expectations changed, and norms modified. Over time a team can be built.

The Manager-as-Developer. The Manager-as-Developer approach has several distinct outcomes that research has associated with effective organizations. The following is a summary of those outcomes (Bradford & Cohen, 1984):

> **First**: the chance is increased that tasks will be accomplished at a high level of quality. Task excellence is more likely when

members seize new opportunities as they develop; uncover problems and difficulties early, before they become major crises; share their knowledge and expertise; and feel committed to carrying out decisions.

Second: increased feelings of responsibility by staff members are not limited to task issues but extend to managerial ones as well.

Third: increased staff motivation results from sharing responsibility and control. Shared responsibility increases job challenge, personal learning, influence, and opportunity.

In action, the Manager-as-Developer model consists of three components that must be stressed to ensure that excellence is achieved. A summary of these components follows:

Component 1: Building a Shared-Responsibility Team. Schools and school districts face complex problems whose solutions require complicated coordination before they can be achieved and then implemented. The solution is for the leader to build a team that shares in the responsibility of managing the school. A school team is not a group whose function is to advise and counsel the leader; it is a joint responsibility group that shares in making the core decisions and in influencing each other to insure high-level performance.

Component 2: Continuous Development of Individual Skills. A shared-responsibility team can work well only when all members have the skills to master these additional responsibilities. A team cannot mature if some of its members can't be trusted to take responsibility. For members to engage in consensual decision making and mutual influence, they must have managerial and interpersonal skills. And if members are to comment on problems that involve their colleagues, they must have enough technical knowledge of these areas to help form judicious decisions.

Component 3: Determining and Building a Common Vision. A larger purpose gives meaning to work, whether routine or non-routine. The leader must articulate and gain member commitment to an exciting over-arching goal.

Such a goal fulfills several functions:

1. The goal unites and inspires members with a vision that justifies extra effort. People do not want to work for money alone; financial security alone cannot inspire people to give their best consistently. If staff members are to move beyond a minimum level of performance and above the mediocre, there has to be a purpose — a reason that makes the extra effort worthwhile.

2. The goal serves as a standard by which to make decisions. If the goal is specific enough, it can be a guideline for choosing among options.

3. The goal makes clear the direction toward which the school should strive --it defines the future. By specifying the area in which the school seeks to be excellent, the goal points toward tomorrow and can carry members beyond today's irritations.

Behaviors of Principals that Support Change

Research shows that effective principals move a school toward a vision of *what could be* rather than maintaining what is. Yet, there are many pressures on principals to emphasize organizational maintenance activities rather than to risk change. Research on educational change suggests that effective principals may, in fact, need two types of vision -- a vision of their schools and of their own roles in those schools, and a vision of the change process itself. The first vision provides a framework within which to act on a daily basis and the second provides a standard against which to assess the effects of their behavior (Manasse, 1985). Fullan (1982) warns that principals who operate only as administrators and as ad hoc crisis managers are not effective in helping to bring about changes in their schools.

Principal's Role in Change

A small body of research has begun to focus on what principals do in the process of providing leadership for change. Reinhard, Arends, Kutz, Lovell, and Wyant (1980) conducted a study funded by Teacher Corps to investigate principal behaviors that support or hinder externally funded change projects. In doing their research, the investigators divided the change process into four stages and looked at the principal's role in each stage. The four stages were (1) planning and initiation, (2) building a temporary operating system for the project, (3) developing and implementing, and (4) ending and institutionalizing. At each stage, they found specific contributions by the principal that were crucial to project success.

Crucial at the first stage (planning and initiation) was the principal's agreement with the project, his or her input into the project proposal, and the communication, support, and enthusiasm projected to others. At the second stage, successful projects had principals who took an active, positive role in the project, *sold* the project to the superintendent, and quickly provided all necessary material and personnel resources. During the stage of development and implementation, successful principals remained interested and ever ready to help solve any problems that might arise. It was during this period that principals in successful projects began to turn over operation of the project to other personnel. In the fourth stage, the critical behaviors for successful principals were a continuing commitment to the project and an ability to provide the resources needed for project continuation.

Patterns of Principals' Facilitating Behavior

Thomas (1978) studied principals from more than 60 schools with alternative school programs and focused on how school principals managed the diverse educational programs in their schools. From this study, she identified three patterns of principal behavior related to facilitating the alternative program. The principals' actions were classified as those of either a director, administrator, or facilitator. Thomas (1978, 12-13) described these roles as follows:

> **Director** - this principal makes the decisions in the school, both procedural and substantive, and will take a great interest in things affecting the classroom, such as curriculum, teaching techniques, and staff development and training, as well as those things affecting the school as a whole, such as scheduling and budgeting. Teachers in a school with this type of principal contribute to decisions affecting the classroom, but the principal retains final decision-making authority.

> **Administrator** - this principal tends to separate procedural decisions from substantive decisions, and gives teachers a large measure of autonomy in their own classroom — over what they teach and how they teach — but will tend to make the decisions in areas that affect the school as a whole. This type of principal perceives the principal's functions as distinct from those of faculty and tends to identify with district management rather than with staff.
>
> **Facilitator** - this principal perceives the principal's role as one of support, whose primary function will be to assist teachers in the performance of their duties. Unlike the administrator, however, this principal will be more concerned with process than procedures. Principals who exhibit this type of behavior often perceive themselves as colleagues of their faculty and are most apt to involve their teachers in the decision-making process.

Thomas concludes that although many factors affect implementation, the leadership of the principal appears to be one of the most important factors in the success or demise of an alternative program. Schools under the leadership of a directive or facilitative principal had greater success in implementing the alternative programs than did schools headed by an administrator-type principal. Furthermore, where strong leadership was lacking, the alternative programs tended to offer something different from what was originally intended, and teachers within the program tended to follow disparate classroom practices.

Hall, Hord, and Griffin (1980) found that in schools where the principal was concerned about the teachers' use of a specific innovation, the manner in which the teachers were using the innovation was more consistent. Stallings and Mohlman (1981), who studied the implementation of a specific program (Effective Use of Time Program), found that in schools with more supportive principals more teachers implemented the training program. In this study, principals were rated as supportive when they were observed to (1) go out of their way to help teachers, (2) be constructive in their criticism and to explain reasons for suggesting change in behavior, (3) share new ideas, (4) set good examples by being on time and staying late, (5) be well prepared, and (6) care for the personal welfare of the teachers.

Categories of Facilitation Actions

Interventions required of facilitators to support school change are documented in Hord and Huling-Austin (1986). In a year-long study of principals and others who supplied interventions to teachers in implementing new curriculum programs, four out of six identified categories of facilitation actions appeared in all nine schools studied (Hall & Hord, 1984). These categories were:

1. **Developing supportive organizational arrangements**. Actions such as ordering materials and books, arranging for equipment and its storage, hiring or reallocating personnel, organizing schedules -- managing the logistics and supplying resources.

2. **Training**. Actions such as the formal delivery of inservice and staff development activities to help individuals learn to use new ideas and materials. These are typically provided in large groups, although the training may be differentiated based on individuals' understanding and skills.

3. **Consultation and reinforcement**. Individualized and ongoing assistance to the users of new programs or practices, also referred to as technical assistance, or coaching -- providing personalized attention to specific individuals' needs by clarifying meaning and solving individual problems.

4. **Monitoring and evaluation**. Collecting information about individuals as they work to implement a change, learning about individuals' feelings and concerns and how use of the new program or practice is progressing -- monitoring provides the basis for designing critical help for individual teachers.

In Figure 3, Hord (1987) summarizes and contrasts the results of studies by Gersten and Carnine, by Gall and associates, and the categories that were originally reported by Hall and Hord (1984), four of which were described above. An increasing consensus appears to be developing about the kinds of actions important for principals and other facilitators to provide.

Figure 3

A COMPARISON OF IDENTIFIED FUNCTIONS FOR EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Support Functions	**Instructional Leadership Functions**	**Intervention Game Plan Components**
Gersten & Carnine (1981)	**Gall et al. (1984)**	**Hall & Hord (1984)**
Visible commitment	Priority setting	
Incentive systems	Resource acquisition Institutional policy-making	Developing supportive organizational arrangements
	Training	Training
Technical assistance		Consultation and reinforcement
Monitoring	Monitoring Assessment	Monitoring and Evaluation
	External relations	External communication Dissemination
Explicit strategies		
	Compliance Maintenance	

From: Hord, 1987

Types of Principal Interaction With Staff

An extensive study of the day-to-day interventions of nine elementary school principals involved in facilitating specific curriculum innovations was conducted by Hall, Hord, Huling, Rutherford, and Stiegelbauer (1983). The principals were identified by district administrators as portraying one of three hypothesized change facilitators: initiators, managers, or responders (Hall, Rutherford, Hord, and Huling-Austin, 1984). The following is a description of how principals of the three types interacted with their faculties and supported change efforts:

> **Initiators** have clear, decisive long-range policies and goals that transcend but include implementation of current innovations. They tend to have very strong beliefs about what good schools and teaching should be like and work intensely to attain this vision. Decisions are made in relation to their goals for the school and in terms of what they believe to be best for students, which is based on current knowledge of classroom practice. Initiators have strong expectations for students, teachers, and themselves. They convey and monitor these expectations through frequent contacts with teachers and clear explanation of how the school is to operate and how teachers are to teach. When they feel it is in the best interest of their school, particularly the students, initiators will seek changes in district programs or policies or they will reinterpret them to suit the needs of the school. Initiators are adamant but not unkind; they solicit input from staff and then make decisions in terms of school goals.
>
> **Managers** represent a broader range of behaviors. They demonstrate responsive behaviors in answer to situations or people and they also initiate actions in support of the change effort. The variations in their behavior seem to be linked to their rapport with teachers and central office staff, as well as with how well they understand and buy into a particular change effort. Managers work without fanfare to provide basic support to facilitate teachers' use of an innovation. They keep teachers informed about decisions and are sensitive to teacher needs. They will defend their teachers from what are perceived

> as excessive demands. When they learn that the central office wants something to happen in their school they then become very involved with their teachers in making it happen. Yet, they do not typically initiate attempts to move beyond the district's expectations.
>
> **Responders** place heavy emphasis on allowing teachers and others the opportunity to take the lead. They believe their primary role is to maintain a smoothly running school by focusing on traditional administrative tasks, keeping teachers content and treating students well. They view teachers as strong professionals who are able to carry out instruction with little guidance. Responders emphasize the personal side of their relationships with teachers and others. Before they make decisions they often give everyone an opportunity to have input so as to weigh their feelings or to allow others to make the decision. A related characteristic is the tendency toward making decisions in terms of immediate circumstances rather than in terms of longer range instructional or school goals. This seems to be due in part to their desire to please others and in part to their more limited vision of how their school and staff should change in the future (page 23-24).

Characteristics of the Three Styles

The research on principals as change agents consistently reports that principals can make a difference and that there are some distinguishable ways in which they behave that determine their effectiveness. In the work done on responder, manager, and initiator style principals (Hall, Rutherford, Hord, and Huling, 1984), six dimensions that characterize these three styles have been identified. These six dimensions are vision and goal setting, structuring the school as a work place, managing change, collaborating and delegating, decision making, and guiding and supporting. Within each dimension, behaviors are distinguished for each of the (three) style principals.

For example, one set of descriptions of behaviors in the dimension of Decision Making is the following:

Responder	**Manager**	**Initiator**
Accepts the rules of the district	Lives by the rules of the district, but goes beyond minimum requirements	Respects the rules of the district, but determines behavior by what is required for maximum school effectiveness

Under the dimension of Guiding and Supporting the following set of behaviors is found:

Responder	**Manager**	**Initiator**
Relies on teachers to report how things are going and to share any major problems	Maintains close contact with teachers and the change effort in an attempt to identify things that might be done to assist teachers with the change	Collects and uses information from a variety of sources to monitor the change effort and to plan interventions that will increase the probability of a successful, quality implementation

The entire set of descriptions of the six dimensions may be found in Appendix D.

Summary of Change-Facilitating Principal Behaviors

To summarize the behaviors of effective change-facilitating principals found across all studies, the following articulation (Rutherford, Hord, Huling, & Hall, 1983, p. 113) may be useful:

> They have a clear vision of short- and long-range goals for the school.

They work intensely with stubborn persistence to attain their vision.

Achievement and happiness of students is their first priority.

They have high expectations for students, teachers, and themselves.

They are actively involved in decision making relative to instructional and administrative affairs.

They attend to instructional objectives as well as instructional strategies and planning.

They collect information that keeps them well informed about the
performance of their teachers.

They will involve teachers in decision making but within the framework of established goals and expectations.

Directly or indirectly they provide for development of teachers' knowledge and skills.

They protect the school and faculty from unnecessary intrusions.

They will seek policy changes at the district level for benefit of the school.

They give enthusiastic support to the change.

They provide for the personal welfare of teachers.

They model the norms they want teachers to support.

They aggressively seek support for resources within and outside the school to foster goals of the school.

* * *

Leadership for change -- as presented in this section -- clearly requires school administrators to move beyond bureaucratic assumptions, traditional management practices, and expectations for maintaining the status quo. If the Southwestern region, indeed, if the United States, is truly interested in developing a system of education that produces students prepared for the 21st century, that goes beyond mediocrity, and that achieves excellence -- then the messages presented in this document should be seriously considered and acted upon.

Section Five
Summary and Conclusions

This document addresses the dimensions of effective school leadership. Two major issues are dealt with, both related to moving schools toward excellence. The primary issue revolves around school effectiveness and the leadership role of the principal. The synthesis of the literature reveals that administrators who empower others and tap their expertise, energy, and enthusiasm demonstrate that leadership functions can be cooperatively exercised to foster school excellence. The second issue focuses on the school organizational structures that support and make possible the dynamics of the kind of leadership expressed so eloquently in the literature.

Why the attention to school leadership? The attention given to leadership at the school level has been increasing as a result of its consistent identification by researchers as a significant factor in effective schools. Fullan (1982), Manasse (1985), and others have reported that the principal's effectiveness is also related to the other correlates in effective schools: school climate conducive to learning, a school-wide emphasis on instruction, high teacher expectations for student achievement, and systematic monitoring of pupil performance.

The research on the role and daily activities of principals clearly indicates that school administrators have a broad and highly demanding job. Studies indicate that a very large percentage of their time is spent meeting management expectations. At the same time, they are expected to provide leadership for guiding the school in change and improvement efforts. It is an understatement to assert that it is nearly impossible for all principals to do all of this well.

However, there are some principals who manage to juggle all these responsibilities in such a way that their schools are recognized as effective. The research reported in this document on the principal's role in leadership and change suggests that, in fact, principals who are successful in managing and leading their schools are using a model of shared leadership and a collaborative approach where teachers have important roles. This research lends support to teachers who are expressing active interest in participating in making decisions that affect their professional roles. Thus, an organizational model that accommodates and supports such collaborative administrator/teacher leadership relationships is necessary.

Bureaucratic organization has traditionally provided the mechanisms by which a school system coordinates the activities of teachers and other school professionals and limits and controls the amount of discretion those individuals exercise (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). The bureaucratic model requires clear lines of authority, rules formulated by superiors to govern subordinates, and centralized evaluation, planning, and decision making (Bacharach & Conley, (1986). Schools that are organized on the bureaucratic model tend to overemphasize specialization of tasks, routine operating rules, and formal procedures in organizing for teaching and learning. Within the bureaucratic model, even though administrators may solicit subordinate input and delegate important tasks, the underlying assumption is that good administrators are the only ones who are able to see the overall view of what the school should be doing and the one who should have the responsibility for seeing that success is obtained (Bradford & Cohen, 1984).

The bureaucratic model (sometimes to referred to as the *factory model* by its detractors) is based on the assumption that the school system is tightly coupled. Tightly coupled systems are characterized by (1) rules, (2) agreement on what those rules are, (3) a system of inspection to see whether compliance occurs, and (4) feedback designed to improve compliance (Weick, 1982). Schools, however, typically are loosely coupled in most areas and missing one or more of the characteristics of tightly coupled systems. A loosely-coupled system is more elusive, less tangible, harder to grasp, harder to administer, and requires a different set of perceptions and behaviors than does a tightly coupled, bureaucratic system (Weick, 1982).

Changes in the social environment in which the school operates have made many of the practices of the past not only obsolete but actually detrimental to implementing school improvement reforms. In today's schools, many of those evaluated by the principal know more about their own work than the principal does. Teachers and other school staff are usually as well-educated as administrators. In addition, authority is undergoing a change that has been described in the management literature as a loss or erosion. The contemporary worker appears to be disillusioned with bureaucratic managers and no longer automatically assigns them power. The manager is expected to give meaning to work by being someone *worth* working for rather than someone performing an organizational role.

What happens when modern, complex organizations are managed with a traditional bureaucratic style? Information does not flow freely and easily to the right places, often resulting in lower quality decisions. In addition, traditional managers who shoulder the responsibility for coordinating all activities decrease the responsibility felt by subordinates for the success or failure of any effort. The frustrating part of this situation for administrators is that greater effort on their part only exacerbates the problem. While increasingly heroic efforts are demanded of the administrator, the abilities of school staff are ignored, resulting in lowered motivation throughout the school (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). As Seeley (1985) puts it, "The underlying structure of the bureaucratic model often limits the effectiveness of good principals, but what is worse, (it) has a tendency to produce principals who subscribe to those bureaucratic values and procedures that actually obstruct teaching."

Some of the alternative organizational structures suggested to replace the Bureaucratic Model are the Professional Bureaucratic Model, the Cooperative Bureaucratic Model, and the School-Based Management Model. Most educational researchers, including the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987), endorse school-based management and the realignment of responsibilities that such change would entail. The report of the Commission stated that a *revolution* in education will require changes in the way schools actually operate so that individual schools will have more control over curricular, personnel, and budget matters; and this revolution will need competent, skilled, visionary leadership of a kind not often seen before.

School administrators, both at the district and school level, are the backbone of any school improvement effort. Ultimately, those who run the schools have to accept responsibility for the success or failure of those schools as learning centers. One of the more extensive and rigorous attempts to identify the competencies of effective principals was carried out by the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM: Croghan & Lake, 1984). This study identified *essential* or basic competencies considered prerequisites for *adequate performance* as a school principal -- a high concern for school mission, a concern for the school's image, an ability to manage by consensus, and an ability to direct quality improvement. These competencies were demonstrated about as frequently by *moderate-performing principals* as they were by *high-performing principals*. In addition, the study identified optimal or high-performing competencies that were demonstrated significantly more often by the principals whose students were performing well beyond expectations. The high-performing principals demonstrated competencies of superior analytic ability, a strong sense of control, and the ability to be objective in their perceptions. Also, the high performers were persuasive, had a high commitment to quality, and were able to bring about focused change in the schools as needed (Croghan & Lake, 1984).

The sheer number and complexity of the competencies identified by the research as characteristic of effective administrators staggers the mind. It is inconceivable that any one person could embody all of these competencies. Research findings suggest it is a rare administrator that manages this heroic task. A wide range of personal, organizational, group, and environmental factors influences the principal's ability to function effectively. Most administrators, of necessity, focus the bulk of their attention on organizational maintenance tasks. Greenfield (1982) pointed out that this occurs in many schools because of one or more of the following factors: the expectations of superiors, the norms of teachers, the dispositions and abilities of principals, the size of the organization and the in-school administrative resources, characteristics of the student population, and/or aspects of the larger environment within which schools operate.

Clearly, the research studies show that the principal has a crucial role in the process of change and school improvement. The principal, as the titular head of the school, holds whatever power and authority accompanies the position and is perceived as the one responsible in the school for making school improvements. Management and guidance are necessary for any system to maintain and improve its efficiency and effectiveness; the principal's leadership role is in the performance of those day-to-day actions that are required to initiate and sustain the change and improvement processes. Instructional leadership means systematically linking everyday management activities to the critical factors that support excellent instruction within all classrooms in the school (Bossert, 1985). It means using the abilities of the school staff to assist in carrying out the leadership functions necessary for linking those management activities to those critical factors.

It is unproductive to continue the practice of placing all the leadership functions solely on the shoulders of the school principal. Barth (1987) suggests that principals, in order not only to survive but flourish, must learn to share problem solving without worrying about appearing inadequate. Teachers should share an equal responsibility for assessing and contributing to the improvement program within their schools. Effective leadership involves developing the conditions in which a school's staff can articulate shared values, goals, and approaches to school improvement

(Bossert, 1985). In practice, effective principals are those whose management protects and enables others to provide leadership. The effective principal creates an environment in which obstacles to innovation are removed and in which teachers are treated as professionals who can themselves improve instruction (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

Nearly 10 years ago, Salley, McPherson, and Baehr (1979) found that, to a certain extent, principals are captives of their environments. The authors warned that unless some environmental characteristics, particularly those related to the organization of the school system, were changed, the work of the principal would continue to be routinely predictable and to perpetuate and reinforce the status quo. It is time to pay heed to that warning. The fact that there are principals who have worked within an essentially bureaucratic structure and still achieved certain results should not serve as a rationale for maintaining the status quo. Policy makers hesitate to ask questions about the effectiveness of the organizational structure of the schools because the answers are complex and do not lend themselves to quick fixes (Bacharach & Conley, 1986). However, the reform movement will not fulfill the high hopes of its supporters as long as reform strategies fail to mesh with the requirements of organizational restructuring (Guthrie, 1986). The consensus among those who have studied the problem is that new policies should be implemented that promote a restructuring of the schools using an organizational model more appropriate for knowledge-work professionals.

For those who are seeking excellence in their schools, the following principles, adapted from Sergiovanni (1987b), should guide their decisions as new school structures are developed:

☐ Cooperative arrangements facilitate teaching and enhance learning.

☐ Feelings of empowerment contribute to ownership and increase commitment and motivation to work.

☐ Responsibility upgrades the importance and significance of work and provides a basis for recognition of success.

- ☐ In successful schools, organizational structures allow staff to be accountable for their decisions and achievements.

- ☐ When jobs are perceived as meaningful, they not only take on a special significance but also provide feelings of intrinsic satisfaction.

- ☐ Successful schools have an organizational structure that promotes authority based on ability rather than on formal roles.

To conclude, developing school structures that encompas those principles requires that policy makers and school administrators look beyond bureaucratic constraints in search of creative new insights and ideas. Efforts to improve teaching and learning will necessitate reorganizing the structure of schools so that they become settings that protect and promote ongoing collaborative improvement efforts. The new dimensions of effective leadership required by such a restructuringshould give vital attention to the professional growth of school administrators in acquiring those skills needed to develop and encourage the participation of others in instructional leadership in the schools.

References

AASA. (1982). Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. *Superintendent Career Development Series, No. 1* (Second edition). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

ASCD. (1985). *With consequences for all*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bacharach, S.B., & Conley, S.C. (1986, May). Education reform: A managerial agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 67 (9), 641-645.

Baldridge, J.V., & Deal, T.E. (1975). *Managing change in educational organizations*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Barth, R.S. (1987). The principal and the profession of teaching. In W. Greenfield, *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 249-270). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Barth, R.S. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68 (4), 293-296.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1978, May). *Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. III: Implementing and sustaining innovations*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Blank, R.K. (1986, April). *Principal leadership in urban high schools: Analysis of variation in leadership characteristics*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspectives and methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bolton, D.L. (1980). *Evaluating administrative personnel in school systems*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bossert, S.T. (1985). Effective elementary schools. In R.M.J. Kyle (Ed.), *Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook* (pp. 39-53). Washington, DC: Teaching and Instruction Division, Teaching and Learning Program, National Institute of Education.

Bossert, T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982, Summer). Towards a school-level conceptualization of instructional management: The principal's role. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). *The competent manager*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bradford, D.L. & Cohen, A.R. (1984). *Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance in contemporary organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweiter, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement. Schools can make a difference.* New York: Praeger.

Brubaker, D.L., & Simon, L.H. (1987, January). How do principals view themselves, others? *NASSP Bulletin*, 71 (495), 72-78.

Burch, B.G., & Danley, W.E. (1980, February). Supervisory role proficiency: A self-assessment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 64, 91-97 .

Burns, J.McG. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Carnegie Quarterly. (1982, Winter). The urban school principal: The rocky road to instructional leadership. 31 (1), 3-7.

Chavkin, N.F., & Williams, Jr., D.L. (1985, November). *Executive summary of the final report: Parent involvement in education project.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Clinton, B. (1986). Who will manage the schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68 (4), 208-210.

Commons, D.L. (Chair). (1985, November). *Who will teach our children?* Sacramento, CA: California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

Conference on Education. (1984, November). *To help or hinder: A study of factors affecting Missouri principals.* A Report from the Conference on Education. St. Louis, MO: Conference on Education.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W.G. (1980). *The principal as instructional leader.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Croghan, J.H., & Lake, D.G. (1984, November). Competencies of effective principals and strategies for implementation. *Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis (Paper No. 410),* Research Triangle Park, N C: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement.

Crowson, R.L., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1980, Winter). The discretionary behavior of principals in large-city schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 16* (1), 45-69.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1985, February). *Peer review in the context of teacher professionalism.* Paper prepared for the American Federation of Teachers Executive Council.

Deal, T.E. (1987). The culture of schools. In L.T. Sheive & M.B. Schoenheit (Eds.), *Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership*, 41 (5), 15-20.

Drake, J.M., & Miller, B.P. (1982, October). The expanding role of the principal in the 1980s. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66 (456), 18-25.

Duckworth, K. (1983). *Specifying determinants of teacher and principal work.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Duke, D. (1986). Perspective: The aesthetics of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22 (1), 7-27.

Duke, D.L. (1982, October). What can principals do? Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66 (456).

Duttweiler, P.C. (1986, April). Educational excellence and motivating teachers. *The Clearing House*, 59, 371-374.

Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subtitles in the principal's role. *Educational Leadership*, 41 (5), 32-37.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37 (1), 15-24.

Education Daily. (1987, Feb.3). Holmes Group turns from teachers to schools in new reform plans. Vol. 20, No. 20, pp. 1-2.

Education USA. (1987, April 6). Administrator union charges AFT infringes on supervisory duties, pp. 237-238.

Education USA. (1986, March 17). ECS Forum: Reforms must be homegrown, say teachers, p. 225.

Education USA. (1986, January 20). Mentor results mixed, p. 157.

Ellett, C.D. (1977). Teacher assessment of principal performances: Their validity and independence of school size and other characteristics. *CCBC Notebook*, 7 (i), 4-21.

Erickson, D.A., & Reller, T.L. (Eds.). (1979). *The principal in metropolitan schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Executive Educator. (1984, August). Effective principals work hard and abhor red tape, pp. 6-7.

Fege, A. (1980, June). Recovering from the cult of innovation: Reflections on change and improvement. *School Administrator*, 37 (6).

Feistritzer, E. (1986). *Teacher crisis: Myth or reality?* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.

Firestone, W.A., & Wilson, B.L. (1985). Invited perspective: Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21 (2), 7-30.

Frataccia, E.V., & Hennington, I. (1982, February). *Satisfaction of hygiene and motivation needs of teachers who resigned from teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX (ERIC No. ED 121 612).

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Fullan, M., & Park, P. (1981). *Curriculum implementation: A resource guide*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Futrell, M.H. (1986, December). *Restructuring teaching: A call for research*. Educational Researcher, 15 (10), 5-8.

Gall, M.D., Fielding, G., Schalock, D., Chartes, Jr., W.W., & Wilczynski, J.M. (1984). *Involving the principal in teachers' staff development: Effects on the quality of mathematics instruction in elementary schools*. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981, September). *Administrative and supervisory support functions for the implementation of effective educational programs for low income students*. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Goldhammer, K., Becker, G. Withycombe, R., Doyel, F., Miller, E., Morgan, C., DeLoretto, L., & Aldridge, B. (1971). *Elementary school principals and their schools: Beacons of brilliance and potholes of pestilence*. Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon.

Gorton, R.A., & McIntyre, K.E. (1978). *The senior high school principalship*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Gottfredson, G.D., & Hybl, L.G. (1986, December). *Inventory of the school administrator's job: Feedback for survey participants*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Greenfield, W. (1987). *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Greenfield, Jr., W.D. (1982). *Research on public school principals: A review and recommendations*. Final Report to The National Institute of Education, Department of Education, under Contract Number 81-02-08.

Guthrie, J.W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68 (4), 305-309.

Guthrie, J.W., & Reed, R.J. (1986). *Educational administration and policy: Effective leadership for American education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hall, G.E., & Hord, S.M. (1984, March). A framework for analyzing what change facilitators do: The intervention taxonomy. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5* (3), 275-307.

Hall, G.E., Hord, S.M., & Griffin, T.H. (1980). Implementation at the school building level: The development and analysis of nine mini-case studies. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G.E., Hord, S.M., Huling, L.L., Rutherford, W.L., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1983). Leadership variables associated with successful school improvement. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G.E., Rutherford, W.L., Hord, S.M., & Huling-Austin, L.L. (1984, February). Effects of three principal styles on school improvement. Educational Leadership, 41 (5), 22-29.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Organizational and social context and the instructional leadership role of the school principal. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting April 20-24, 1987, Washington, DC.

Hargrove, E.C., Scarlett, G.G., Ward, L.E., Abernathy, V., Cunningham, J., & Vaughn, W.K. (1981). Regulations and schools: The implementation of equal education for handicapped children. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Institute for Public Policy Studies.

Heller, T. (1985). Changing authority patterns: A cultural perspective. Academy of Management Review, 10 (3), 488-495.

Hord, S.M. (1987). Evaluating educational innovation. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Hord, S.M., & Hall, G.E. (1987). Three images: What principals do in curriculum implementation. Curriculum Inquiry, 17 (1), 55-89.

Hord, S.M., & Huling-Austin, L.L. (1986, October). Effective curriculum implementation: Some promising new insights. Elementary School Journal, 87 (1), 97-115.

Hord, S.M., Stiegelbauer, S.M., & Hall, G. E. (1984, November). How principals work with other change facilitators. Education and Urban Society, 17 (1), 89-109.

Howard, A., & Bray, D.W. (1980). Continuities and discontinuities between two generations of Bell system managers. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Montreal, Canada.

Huff, S., Lake, D., & Schaalman, M. (1982). Principal differences: Excellence in school leadership and management. Boston: McBer and Company.

Ingram, R.L. (1986, March). Strategic planning must be linked to performance. The School Administrator, 43 (3), 9-11.

Isherwood, E.G. (1973, March). The principal and his authority: An empirical study. High School Journal, 56, 291-303.

Kerr, S.M. (1976). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. In H.E. Schneider, American Decision Sciences Proceedings.

Klopf, G.J., Scheldon, E., & Brennan, K. (1982, March). *The essentials of effectiveness: A job description for principals.* Principal, pp. 35-38.

Koppich, J., Gerritz, W., & Guthrie, J.W. (1985, August 12). *The view from the classroom.* Sacremento, CA: California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

Kottkamp, R.B., Provenzo, Jr., E.F., & Cohn, M.M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67* (8), 559-567.

Kyle, R.M.J. (Ed.). (1985, May). *Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook.* Washington, DC: Teaching and Instruction Division, Teaching and Learning Program, National Institute of Education.

Lake, D.G. (1981). *High performing principals: A synthesis. In review of literature and resources on high-performing principals.* Report presented to the Florida Council on Educational Management.

Larsen, Terry J. (1987). *Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation on academic achievement.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting, April 20-24, 1987, Washington, DC.

Lawrence, D. (1985). Controversy and apprehension among principals nearly killed the Toledo plan. *The American School Board Journal,* 172 (7), 22-23.

Leithwood, K.J., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research,* 52 (3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K.A., & Stager, M. (1986, April). *Differences in problem-solving processes used by moderately and highly effective principals.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Lezotte, L. W. (1982). A response to D'Amico: Not a recipe but a framework. *Educational Leadership,* 49 (3), 63.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of research on improving schools. *Educational Leadership,* 38 (7), 583-586.

Lindelow, J. (1981). School-based management. In S.C. Smith, J.A. Mazzarella, & P.K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for survival* (pp. 94-129). Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Little, J. W. (1982, August-September). *The effective principal. American Education,* pp. 38-42.

Little, J.W. (1981). *School success and staff development in urban segregated schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas.

Little, J.W., & Bird, T.D. (1984). *Is there instructional leadership in high schools? First findings from a study of secondary school administrators and their influence on teachers' professional norms.* A paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Lortie, D.C. (1986). Teacher status in Dade County: A case of structural strain? *Phi Delta Kappan, 67* (8), 568-575.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: Univesity of Chicago Press.

Lyons, J.E. (1981). Competencies needed by beginning principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 65* (446), 59-66.

MacPhail-Wilson, B., & Guth, J. (1983). Effectiveness research and school administration — Both sides of the coin. *NASSP Bulletin, 67* (465), 3-8.

Manasse, A.L. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research. *The Elementary School Journal, 85* (3), 439-463.

Manasse, A. L. (1984). Principals as leaders of high-performing systems. *Educational Leadership,* 41 (5), 42-46.

Manasse, A. L. (1982, March). Effective principals: Effective at what? *Principal,* 10-15.

Martin, D.S., Saif, P.S., & Thiel, L. (1986-1987, Dec.-Jan.). Curriculum development: Who is involved and how? *Educational Leadership, 44* (4), 40-48.

Martin, W. J., & Willower, D. J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 17,* 69-70.

Martinko, M.J., & Gardiner, W.L. (1983). *An executive summary of: The behavior of high performing educational managers: An observational study.* Tallahassee, FL: The Florida State University.

McCormick, K. (1985). This union-backed program is ridding Toledo schools of incompetent teachers. *The American School Board Journal, 172* (7), 19-21.

McCurdy, J. (1983). *The role of the principal in effective schools (AASA Critical Issues Report).* Sacremento, CA: Education News Service.

McEvoy, B. (1987). Everyday acts: How principals influence development of their staffs. *Educational Leadership, 44* (5), 73-77.

Miles, M.B. (1983, November). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. *Educational Leadership, 41* (3), 14-17.

Miles, M.B. (Ed.). (1971). Innovation in education. New York: Columbia University.

Miner, J.B., & Smith, N.R. (1981). Can organizational design make up for motivational decline? *The Wharton Magazine, 5* (4), 29-35.

Morris, M. B. (1978). *The public school as a workplace: The principal as a key element in teacher satisfaction. A study of schooling in the United States.* Dayton, OH: Institute for Development of Educational Activities.

Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Hurwitz, E., & Porter-Gehrie, C. (1981). *The urban principal: Discretionary decision-making in a large educational organization.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

NGA. (1986). *Time for results: The Governors' 1991 report on education.* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

NAESP. (1986). *Proficiencies for principals.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

National Science Foundation. (1983). *Educating Americans for the 21st century: A plan of action for improving mathematics, science, and technology education for all American elementary and secondary students so that their achievement is the best in the world by 1995.* Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

NCEI Reports. (1986, Dec. 15). NCEI survey finds new teachers older, brighter; crisis fears may be overblown, 8 (2), 1-4.

Odden, A. (1983, Jan. 3). Research findings on effective schools. *ERS Issuegram.*

Persell, C.H., & Cookson, Jr., P.W. (1982). *The effective principal in action. In NASSP, The effective principal: A research summary.* Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Persell, C.H., Cookson, Jr., P., & Lyons, H. (1982). *Effective principals: What do we know from various educational literatures?* Paper prepared for the National Conference on the Principalship. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Peters, T.J., & Waterman, R.H., Jr. (1982). *In search of excellence.* New York: Warner Books.

Peterson, K.D. (1984a, December). Mechanisms of administrative control over managers in educational organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29,* 573- 597.

Peterson, K.D. (1984b). *Principals' work processes as a focus of inservice training.* Nashville, TN: The Principals' Institute, Vanderbilt University.

Pfeifer, R.S. (1986, April). *Enabling teacher effectiveness: Teachers' perspectives on instructional management.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Purkey, S.C, & Smith, M.S. (1982). *Effective schools: A review.* Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Rallis, S.F., & Highsmith, M.C. (1986). The myth of the 'great principal': Questions of school management and instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68* (4), 300-304.

Reinhard, D.L., Arends, R.A., Kutz, W., Lovell, K., & Wyant, S. (1980). *Great expectations: The principal's role and inservice needs in supporting change projects.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Roueche, J.W., Baker, III, G.A. (1986). *Profiling excellence in America's schools.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Russell, J.S., Mazzarella, J.A., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985, June). *Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

Rutherford, W.L. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67* (1), 31-34.

Rutherford, W.L., Hord, S.M., Huling-Austin, L.L., & Hall, G.E. (1983). *Change facilitators: In search of understanding their role.* Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Safe Schools Report. (1978). *Violent schools, safe schools: The safe school study report to the congress, Vol. 1.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Salley, C., McPherson, R.B., & Baehr, M.E. (1975). What principals do: A preliminary occupational analysis. In D.A. Erickson & T.L. Reller (Eds.), *The principal in metropolitan schools* (pp. 22-39). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Sarason, B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sashkin, M. (1987). *Principal selection guide.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Sashkin, M. (no date). *The leader's role in effective schools.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Sashkin, M., & Huddle, G. (1986). *The principal's leadership role in creating effective schools.* Draft, unpublished manuscript.

Savage, J.G. (1983, July/August)). Administrative evaluation. *School Administrator, 40,* p. 28.

Schlechty, P.C., & Joslin, A.W. (1986). Images of schools. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept* (pp. 147-161). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Schlechty, P.C. (1985). District level policies and practices supporting effective school management and classroom instruction. In R.M.J. Kyle (Ed.), *Reaching for excellence: An effective schools sourcebook* (pp. 117-129). Washington, DC: Teaching and Instruction Division, Teaching and Learning Program, National Institute of Education.

Schmitt, N., Noe, R., Meritt, R., Fitzgerald, M., & Jorgensen, C. (1983). *Criterion-related and content validity of the NASSP assessment center.* Reston, VA: NASSP.

Schneider, G.T. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18* (1), 25-32.

Seeley, D. (1985, September 23). Teachers choice: Whether to accept the bureaucratic structure or change to a new partnership model. *Education Times.*

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1987a). *The theoretical basis for cultural leadership. In L.T. Sheive & M.B. Schoenheit, Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1987b). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership, 41* (5), 4-14.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration, 5* (1), 66-82.

Sheive, L.T., & Schoenheit, M.B. (1987a). *Vision and the work life of educational leaders. In L.T. Sheive & M.B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sheive, L.T., & Schoenheit, M.B. (Eds.). (1987b). *Leadership: Examining the elusive.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sizer, T.R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, S.C., Mazzarella, J.A., & Piele, P.K. (Eds.). (1981). *School leadership: Handbook for survival.* Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

SREB. (1986). *Effective school principals: A report to the Southern Regional Education Board by its Commission for Educational Quality.* Atlanta, Georgia.

Stallings, J., & Mohlman, G. (1981). *School policy, leadership style, teacher change and student behavior in eight elementary schools.* Prepared for the National Institute of Education by the Stallings Teaching and Learning Institute, Mountain View, CA.

Stewart, R. (1982). The relevance of some studies of managerial work and behavior to leadership research. In J.G. Hunt, U. Sedaran & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership beyond establishment views.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1987). *A time to summarize: Six years and three phases of the Louisiana school effectiveness study.* A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meeting April 20-24, 1987, Washington, DC.

Stronge, J.H., & McVeain, D.A. (1986, Spring). The functional role of the building-level administrator: Head teacher or middle manager? *ERS Spectrum*, pp. 38-40.

Swanson-Owens, D. (1986, May). *Teachers' perspectives on teaching: Enduring and emerging themes.* A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Sweeney, J.T. (1983, October). *Managerial skills and educational productivity.* A paper presented at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Symposium on Educational Productivity,Austin, Texas.

Sweeney, J.T. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. *Educational Leadership, 39* (5), 346-352.

Thomas, M.A. (1978). *A study of alternatives in American education, Vol.II: The role of the principal.* Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Tye, K.A. (1972). The school principal: Key man in educational change. *NASSP Bulletin, 56,* 77-84.

Tye, K.A., & Tye, B.B. (1984). Teacher isolation and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 65* (5), 319-322.

Ubben, G.C., & Hughes, L.W. (1987). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

UCEA. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools: Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration.* Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

Venezky, R., & Winfield, L. (1979). *Schools that succeed beyond expectations in teaching reading.* Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware.

Weick, K.E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63* (10), 673-676.

Wellisch, W., MacQueen, A., Carriere, R., & Duck, G. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. *Sociology of Education*, 51, pp. 211-226.

Yukl, G. (1982). Managerial leadership and the effective principal. In NASSP, *The effective principal* (pp. 1-13), Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX A

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
SKILLS FOR SUCCESSFUL SCHOOL LEADERS

Skills in Designing, Implementing, and Evaluating School Climate

- Human relations, organizational development, and leadership skills.
- Collaborative goal setting and action planning.
- Organizational and personal planning and time management skills.
- Skills in participatory management and the use of variations in staffing.
- Climate assessment methods and skills.
- Skills in improving the quality of relationships among staff and students to enhance learning.
- Multicultural and ethnic understanding.
- Group process, interpersonal communication, and motivation skills.

Skills in Understanding Internal and External Communications and Political Skills and Using Them to Build Local, State, and National Support for Education

- School/community public relations, coalition building, and related activities.
- Politics of school governance and operations.
- Strategies to pass bond, tax, and referenda.
- Lobbying, negotiating, collective bargaining, power, policy development, and policy maintenance skills to ensure successful educational programs.
- Communicating and projecting an articulate position for education.
- Role and function of mass media in shaping and forming opinions.
- Conflict mediation and the skills to accept and cope with inherent controversies.

Skills in Developing Systematic School Curriculum That Ensures Both Extensive Cultural Enrichment Activities and Mastery of Fundamental as well as Progressive, More Complex Skills Required in Advanced Problem Solving, Creative, and Technological Activities

- Planning/futures methods to anticipate occupational trends and their implications.
- Taxonomies of Instructional Objectives and validation procedures for curricular units/sequences.
- Theories of cognitive development and the sequencing/structuring of curricula.
- Develop valid and reliable performance for instructional outcomes.
- Use of computers and other technologies as instructional aids.
- Development/use of available cultural resources.

Skills in Instructional Management

- Curriculum design and instructional delivery strategies.
- Instructional and motivational psychology.
- Alternative methods of monitoring and evaluating student achievement.
- Management of change to enhance the mastery of educational goals.
- Applications of computer management to the instructional program.
- Use of instructional time and resources.
- Cost effectiveness and program budgeting.

Skills in Designing Staff Evaluation Systems to Enhance Effectiveness of Educational Personnel

- Evaluating administrator and supervisor performance.
- Evaluating teacher performance.
- Evaluating other staff members.

Skills in Designing Staff Development and Evaluation Systems to Enhance Effectiveness of Educational Personnel

- System and staff needs assessment to identify areas for concentrated staff development and resource allocation for new personnel.
- Using clinical supervision as a staff improvement and evaluation strategy.
- Assessment of individual and institutional sources of stress and development of methods for reducing stress.

Skills in Allocating Human, Material, and Financial Resources Efficiently, in an Accountable Manner to Ensure Successful Student Learning

- Facilities planning, maintenance, and operation.
- Financial planning and cash flow management.
- Personnel administration.
- Pupil personnel services and categorical programs.
- Legal concepts, regulations and codes for school operations.
- Analytical techniques of management.

Skills in Conducting Research and Using Research Findings in Decision Making to Improve Long-Range Planning, School Operations, and Student Learning

- Research designs and methods including gathering, analyzing, and interpreting data.
- Descriptive and inferential statistics.
- Evaluation and planning/futures models and methods.
- Selection, administration, and interpretation of evaluation instruments.

From: Hoyle, J.R., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1985). *Skills for successful school leaders.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

APPENDIX B

FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT

DEFINITIONS AND BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS FOR THE HIGH-PERFORMING COMPETENCIES

PURPOSE AND DIRECTION CLUSTER

1. Proactive Orientation

Takes the role of being fully "in charge" and responsible for all that happens in a situation or a job; reflects an "internal control" orientation in which the person behaves with the full assumption that they can be the "cause" and can move events, create change and achieve goals; initiates action and readily takes responsibility for all aspects of the situation--even beyond ordinary boundaries--and for success and failure in task accomplishment; initiates actions of self and others to learn about the organization and to achieve goals.

Behavioral Indicators:

1.1 Takes overall responsibility for progress of a group or a task or for obtaining and using resources.

1.2 Initiates actions, proposals or plans for self and others to accomplish tasks.

1.3 Accepts and portrays personal responsibility for failures/barriers and learns from experiences to overcome potential or real barriers.

1.4 Accepts ultimate responsibility for staff, students and teachers.

2. Decisiveness

Expresses forcefulness and confidence when a decision is made. A readiness to make decisions, render judgments, take actions and commit oneself and others regardless of the quality of the decision.

Behavioral Indicators:

2.1 Expresses little ambivalence about decisions that have been made (but may recognize alternatives).

2.2 Is forceful and self confident in making decisions.

COGNITIVE SKILL CLUSTER

4. Interpersonal Search

Is able to discover, understand and verbalize the concepts, thoughts, ideas held by others; is not only sensitive to the ideas and opinions of others but behaves to ensure an understanding of the feelings and verbalizations of others.

Behavioral Indicators:

4.1 Uses probing repetition to have others describe their own perspectives, ideas and feelings.

4.2 Is able to discover and understand the ideas and concepts of others--from their point of view.

4.3 Uses summary, clarification and paraphrasing to test the accuracy of one's conception of another's perspective; e.g., of a teacher, a student.

5. Information Search

Searches for and gathers many different kinds of information before arriving at an understanding of an event or a problem; uses formal and informal observation, search and interaction to gather information about the environment; is aware of the breadth (number of sources) and depth (what is learned from each relevant source) of information search.

Behavioral Indicators:

5.1 Gathers information about problems from a variety of sources or events before making a decision or committing resources.

5.2 Is aware of breadth (or the number of different sources) of information search.

5.3 Gathers sufficient information is each essential area searched (both inside and outside the organization) in order to arrive at relevant ideas or concepts. Strives to be well informed.

6. Concept Formation

Is able to form concepts, hypotheses, ideas on the basis of information; can reorder information into ideas, see relationships between patterns of information from different sources, and can link information separated spatially or over time; uses a logical process of forming ideas based on information from different sources.

Behavioral Indicators:

6.1 Develops a concept in order to make sense out of an array of information separated in space or time.

6.2 Finds meaning themes or patterns in a sequence of events or inputs.

6.3 Uses insight that emerges after examining an issue or a problem which is usually labeled and used for diagnostic purposes and for stating cause-and-effect relationships.

6.4 Perceives relationships between important events or links related events into broader meanings (e.g., in In-Basket).

7. Conceptual Flexibility

Is able to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when discussing problem solving or making a decision; can view a person or an event from different perspectives; can devise alternative plans or courses of action and can visualize the pros and cons of each; considers information from different points of view in arriving at a decision; is able to view an event from multiple perspectives simultaneously.

Behavioral Indicators:

7.1 Views events from different (multiple) perspectives simultaneously.

7.2 In group situations, keeps different group members' perspectives "on the table" for discussion.

7.3 Discovers and uses these conflicting or different views of events in problem solving and dialogue.

7.4 Takes into account the perspective of subordinates, managers in the person's own unit (e.g., department, school) and significant "others" outside the person's unit and organization in planning and problem solving.

7.5 Forms and uses multiple concepts in problem solving and interpersonal and group interaction.

7.6 Includes people from groups with different perspectives in planning groups (e.g., students and parents in a school setting and citizens of the school community).

CONSENSUS MANAGEMENT CLUSTER

8. Managing Interaction

Is able to get others to interact, to stimulate others to work together, to understand each other, to resolve conflict or agree to its presence, to encourage others to reach mutual agreement; uses own and others' ideas to initiate and stimulate dialogue between others; demonstrates good group process and facilitator skills.

Behavioral Indicators:

8.1 Stimulates others to interact in a group situation. Is able to get another to present and stimulate others to respond.

8.2 Is able to get others to state their perspectives and then discuss relationships and can motivate the group to move toward mutual agreement.

8.3 Is able to get people from different groups or conflicting groups to engage in dialogue.

8.4 Facilitates an integrating role in interpersonal and group situation.

9. Persuasiveness

The ability to persuade or influence others through a number of possible means: gaining and sustaining their attention and interest in a group situation; using information or arguments, modeling the behaviors expected; or being direct in specifying what others will do.

Behavioral Indicators:

9.1 Demonstrates ability to influence or persuade others to support one's ideas or goals.

9.2 Uses a variety of techniques; e.g., modeling expected behavior, using information and expertise or authority, being directive. Whichever technique is used the operation here is "success in influencing."

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT CLUSTER

12. Achievement Motivation

States high internal work standards; verbalizes personal and group goals as a desire to do something better--better feedback on measures of how well self or group is doing; shows frustration in meeting barriers or in response to own or others' mistakes or failures.

Behavioral Indicators:

12.1 Expresses a desire to do the task better, better than it was done previously, better than others do it, or better according to some objective or subjective standard.

12.2 Makes expectations of high performance, excellence or high productivity known to others.

12.3 Expresses frustration with barriers to reaching standards of excellence.

12.4 Wants measures of own productivity and performance in order to plot or assess progress.

13. Management Control

Devises opportunities to receive adequate and timely feedback about the progress of work accomplishments of others; follows up on delegated activities or provides plans for or taking action on feedback of information to others about meeting standards of productivity.

Behavioral Indicators:

13.1 Plans and schedules follow-up for all delegated and assigned activities.

13.2 Monitors the performance of managers and subordinates and schedules reviews.

13.3 Plans and initiates activities which help in observing the work and progress of others--both of individuals and department or grade level.

13.4 Informs others when their work is not meeting standards.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLUSTER

15. Organizational Ability

Sets plans and promotes to accomplish goals; schedules activities and the use of human and other resources for accomplishing goals; focuses on time, deadlines, flow of activities or resources on ways to get the job done.

Behavioral Indicators:

15.1 Makes schedules, budgets own time; shows a concern for time and schedule.

15.2 Reviews a task and then plans; e.g., reviews all items on desk and then proceeds with a plan and schedule. Uses this style in work or simulation situations.

15.3 Establishes priorities, handling important issues first, allocating more time to high-priority issues.

15.4 Organizes the activities of a group in order to develop a logical plan--what will be done first, second, and so forth, meetings and points of communication.

COMMUNICATION CLUSTER

17. Self-Presentation

Is able to clearly present ones own ideas, others' ideas and information in an open and genuine way; is able to share ideas with others in an open, informative, non-evaluative manner; effectively uses technical, symbolic, non-verbal and visual aids or graphics in order to get the message across.

Behavioral Indicators:

17.1 Is able to communicate own ideas to others in one-on-one or group situations in a clear, informative manner. The criteria is not persuasion but the degree to which the presentation was understood.

17.2 Can stimulate others to ask questions about own issues.

17.3 Is able to present in a way which is not interpreted as "demanding conformity" or control.

DEFINITIONS AND BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS FOR BASIC COMPETENCIES

PURPOSE AND DIRECTION CLUSTER

3. Commitment to School Mission

Holds a set of values about the school; e.g., welfare of the students, fairness to staff; exhibits consistent behavior with values despite barriers.

Behavioral Indicators:

3.1 Promotes the welfare of the students.

3.2 Displays a humane concern for the feelings of teachers, parents and students.

3.3 Takes difficult actions, which may be unpopular, when the welfare of students seem to be at stake.

3.4 Emphasizes the importance of fairness in providing opportunities, distributing priorities, administering discipline and distributing funds.

CONSENSUS MANAGEMENT CLUSTER

10. Concern For Image

Shows concern for the image of the school via the impressions created by the students and staff and manages these impressions and public information about the school.

Behavioral Indicators:

10.1 Advertises successes.

10.2 Controls the flow of negative information.

11. Tactical Adaptability

States the rationale for using particular strategies; e.g., to influence certain groups. tailors style of interaction to fit the situation and changes style if it does not succeed.

Behavioral Indicators:

11.1 Indicates that an activity will be challenging.

11.2 Tailors one's style of interaction to the audience one wishes to influence.

11.3 Adjusts strategy or adopts a different strategy when one is unsuccessful.

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT CLUSTER

14. Developmental Orientation

Holds high and positive expectations about others' potential, views developing others as a property of the principal's job; works with others as a coach, discussing performance problems, providing feedback about performance and giving reassurance for development while allowing the person to take individual responsibility.

Behavioral Indicators:

14.1 Holds high expectations about the potential of other people to develop.

14.2 Works to help others do their job better and uses follow-up in order to develop others.

14.3 Gives support, approval or recognition for developmental activities of others.

14.4 Instills a value of "developing others" in own staff members.

ORGANIZATION CLUSTER

16. Delegation

Delegates authority and responsibility clearly and appropriately in accomplishing organizational goals; this must be differentiated from organization, that is, from the normal assignment of tasks which people routinely do; delegates a project not currently a routine part of the person's job; e.g., gathering information, developing a proposal or a plan, implementing a project.

Behavioral Indicators:

16.1 Clearly delegates an activity which is not a routine task. Delegation should specify the authority; e.g., "complete the task and then let us discuss your decision." Do the initial phase and then check with me before you make a decision."

16.2 Delegates defined activities; e.g., information gathering, planning, implementing.

COMMUNICATION CLUSTER

18. Written Communication

Clear, concise and properly structured written communication.

Behavioral Indicators:

18.1 Expresses meanings clearly in memos and letters.

18.2 Uses adequate vocabulary.

18.3 Uses correct spelling and punctuation.

18.4 Uses appropriate and correct sentence and paragraph construction.

19. Organizational Sensitivity

The awareness of the effects of one's behavior and decisions on other people and other groups in and outside the organization.

Behavioral Indicators:

19.1 Responds tactfully in both written and oral communication to others in and out of the organization.

19.2 Keeps persons in the organization informed when information received is relevant or could be relevant to them.

19.3 Considers the position, feelings and perspectives of others when planning, making decisions and organizing.

Croghan, J.H., & Lake, D.G. (1984, November). Competencies of effective principals and strategies for implementation. *Occasional Papers in Educational Policy Analysis (Paper No. 410)*, Research Triangle P]ark, N C: Southeastern Regional Council for Educational Improvement.

APPENDIX C

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE BEHAVIORS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS LINKED WITH SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

CHARACTERISTIC 1: SCHOOL-WIDE MEASUREMENT AND RECOGNITION OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Effective Behaviors

A. Makes special efforts in addition to regular ongoing systems to give high quality recognition for academic achievement.

B. Sets up ongoing systems to provide recognition of academic success.

C. Encourages the use of standardized testing for student academic performance.

D. Gives personal recognition to individual students for their specific academic achievements.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Mishandles student recognition.

B. Ignores or misuses standardized tests.

CHARACTERISTIC 2: ORDERLY AND STUDIOUS ENVIRONMENT

Effective Behaviors

A. Enforces discipline personally with students.

B. Establishes and enforces a clear code of conduct regarding rules such as attendance and absence policies.

C. Provides support and back-up for enforcement of discipline.

D. Assigns staff and resources to confront violation of established rules.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Permits student behavior that creates disorderly environment and disrupts classroom time.

B. Enforces discipline in a weak or inappropriate manner.

C. Does not establish and enforce a clear code of conduct including attendance and absence policies.

D. Avoids enforcement of discipline and promotion of a studious atmosphere.

CHARACTERISTIC 3: HIGH EMPHASIS ON CURRICULUM ARTICULATION

Effective Behaviors

A. Ensures scope and sequence exists and is being adhered to.

B. Demonstrates knowledge and interest in each curriculum.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Does not ensure scope and sequence exists and is being adhered to for each curriculum.

B. Does not provide administrative support for curriculum problems.

CHARACTERISTIC 4: SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL TASKS

Effective Behaviors

A. Supports teacher decisions and needs with action.

B. Provides atmosphere and resources to complete staff instructional tasks.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Denies teachers supplies and resources through misadministration.

B. Displays a lack of confidence and respect for teachers.

C. Makes unreasonable demands on teachers outside of teaching responsibilities.

CHARACTERISTIC 5: HIGH EXPECTATIONS AND CLEAR GOALS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS

Effective Behaviors

A. Encourages students to pursue challenging academic goals.

B. Establishes school-wide academic requirements.

C. Expects counseling programs to challenge students.

D. Sets instructional standards for teachers.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Minimizes importance of academic achievement in discussions with students.

B. Does not set specific goals for student performance.

C. Allows students to get by with unchallenging student academic schedules.

CHARACTERISTIC 6: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WITH STAFF

Effective Behaviors

A. Listens actively to staff and faculty ideas and creates opportunities for staff to express ideas.

B. Provides resources and a supportive environment for collaborative planning.

C. Establishes school-wide goals and programs through staff input and participation.

D. Staffs committees with representatives from all sides.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Avoids staff involvement in decisions or discussions.

B. Provides little or no feedback after meetings.

C. Does not provide resources or support for collaborative planning.

CHARACTERISTIC 7: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR TEACHERS

Effective Behaviors

A. Takes an active role in planning, conducting, implementing, and evaluating inservice training.

B. Provides direction and support for individual teachers to eliminate poor instructional performance.

C. Provides direct instructional leadership in one-to-one interactions with individual teachers.

D. Makes sure specifics of each teacher's classroom performance are evaluated.

E. Hires an effective staff.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Does not provide effective feedback on instructional skills.

B. Denies importance of inservice programs.

C. Does not provide adequate classroom evaluation.

D. Hires teachers without an emphasis on teaching performance.

E. Does not require teacher improvement.

CHARACTERISTIC 8: PARENTAL SUPPORT FOR THE EDUCATION OF STUDENTS

Effective Behaviors

A. Obtains active parental involvement in school activities.

B. Communicates personally with parents of individual students.

C. Informs parents of special programs and activities.

D. Interacts directly with parents and citizens to promote the school.

E. Establishes direct personal contact between parents and teachers.

Ineffective Behaviors

A. Avoids interpersonal communication with parents.

B. Communicates in a manner that will make parents angry or feel negative toward the school.

C. Discourages parental involvement.

D. Succumbs to nonacademic special interest groups.

E. Does not meet with parents on positive topics.

From: Russell, J.S., Mazzarella, J.A., White, T., & Maurer, S. (1985, June). *Linking the behaviors and activities of secondary school principals to school effectiveness: A focus on effective and ineffective behaviors.* Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

APPENDIX D

Indicators of Change Facilitator Style

Dimensions/ Behaviors	*Responder*	*Manager*	*Initiator*
Vision and Goal Setting	Accepts district goals as school goals	Accepts district goals but makes adjustments at school level to accommodate particular needs of the school	Respects district goals but insists on goals for school that give priority to this school's student needs
	Allows others to generate the initiative for any school improvement that is needed	Engages others in regular review of school situation to avoid any reduction in school effectiveness	Identifies areas in need of improvement and initiates action for change
	Relies primarily on others for introduction of new ideas into the school	Open to new ideas and introduces some to faculty as well as allowing others in school to do so	Sorts through new ideas presented from within and outside the school and implements those deemed to have high promise for school improvement in designated priority areas
	Future goals/direction of school are determined in response to district level goals/priorities	Anticipates the instructional and management needs of school and plans for them	Takes the lead in identifying future goals and priorities for the school and for accomplishing them.
	Responds to teachers', students' and parents' interest in terms of goals of school and district	Collaborates with others in reviewing and identifying school goals	Establishes framework of expectations for the school and involves others in setting goals within that framework
Structuring the School as a Work Place	Grants teachers much autonomy and independence and allows them to provide guidelines for students	Provides guidelines and expectations for teachers and parents to maintain effective operation of the school	Sets standards and expects high performance levels for teachers, students and self
	Ensures that school and district policies are followed and strives to see that disruptions in the school day are minimal	Works with teachers, students and parents to maintain effective operation of the school	Establishes instructional program as first priority; personal and collaborative efforts are directed at supporting that priority
	Responds to requests and needs as they arise in an effort to keep all involved persons comfortable and satisfied	Expects all involved to contribute to effective instruction and management	Insists that all persons involved give priority to teaching and learning
	Indefinitely delays having staff do tasks if it is perceived staff are overloaded	Contends that staff are already very busy and paces request and task loads accordingly	Will knowingly sacrifice short term feelings of staff if doing a task now is necessary for the success of longer term school goals
	Allows school norms to evolve over time	Helps establish and clarify norms for the school	Establishes, clarifies and models norms for the school
Managing Change	Accepts district expectations for change	Meets district expectations for changes required	Accommodates district expectations for change and pushes adjustments and additions that will benefit his/her school

Indicators of Change Facilitator Style

Dimensions/ Behaviors	*Responder*	*Manager*	*Initiator*
	Sanctions the change process and attempts to resolve conflicts when they arise	Maintains regular involvement in the change process sometimes with a focus on management and at other times with a focus on the impact of the change	Directs the change process in ways that aim toward effective innovation use by all teachers
	Relies on information provided by other change facilitators, usually from outside the school for knowledge of the innovation	Uses information from a variety of sources for gaining knowledge of the innovation	Seeks out information from teachers, district personnel and others to gain an understanding of the innovation and its demands
	Develops minimal knowledge of what use of the innovation entails	Becomes knowledgeable about general use of the innovation and what is needed to support use	Develops sufficient knowledge about use to be able to make specific teaching suggestions and troubleshoot problems that may emerge
	Communicates expectations relative to change only in very general terms	Informs teachers that they are expected to use the innovation	Gives teachers specific expectations and steps regarding use of the innovation
	Monitors change effort primarily through brief, spontaneous conversations and unsolicited reports	Monitors the change effort through planned conversations with individuals and groups and informal observations of instruction	Closely monitors the change effort through classroom observation, review of lesson plans and student performance
	Information gained through monitoring may or may not be discussed with a teacher	Information gained through monitoring is discussed with teachers and compared with expected behavior	Information gained through monitoring is fed back directly to teachers, compared with expected behavior and a plan for next steps including improvement is established
Collaborating and Delegating	Ideas are registered by every staff member with one or two most heavily influencing the ultimate flow	Ideas are offered by both staff and the principal and consensus is gradually developed	Ideas are sought from teachers as well as their reactions to principal's ideas, then priorities are set
	Allows others to assume responsibility for the change effort	Tends to do most of the intervening on the change effort but will share some responsibility	Will delegate to carefully chosen others some of the responsibility for the change effort
	Those who assume responsibility have considerable autonomy and independence	Coordinates responsibilities and stays informed about how others are handling their responsibilities	Establishes first which responsibilities will be delegated and how they are to be accomplished, then monitors closely the carrying out of tasks
	Those who assume responsibility are more likely to be from outside the school e.g. district facilitators	Others who assume responsibility may come from within or from outside the school	Others who assume responsibility are likely to be from within the school

Indicators of Change Facilitator Style

Dimensions/ Behaviors	*Responder*	*Manager*	*Initiator*
Decision Making	Accepts the rules of the district	Lives by the rules of the district, but goes beyond minimum requirements	Respects the rules of the district but determines behavior by what is required for maximum school effectiveness
	As the deadlines approach makes those decisions required for ongoing operation of the school	Actively involved in routine decision-making relative to instructional and administrative affairs	Routine decisions are handled through established procedures and assigned responsibilities. Non-routine decisions are handled with dispatch following solicitation of teacher ideas
	Decisions are influenced more by immediate circumstances of the situation and formal policies than longer term consequences	Decisions are based on the norms and expectations that guide the school and the management needs of the school	Decisions are based on the standards of high expectations and what is best for the school as a whole, particularly learning outcomes and the longer term goals
	Allows all interested parties to participate in decision-making or to make decisions independently	Allows others to participate in decision making, but maintains control of the process through personal involvement	Allows others to participate in decision making and delegates decision making to others but within carefully established parameters related to goals and expectations
Guiding and Supporting	Believes teachers are professionals and leaves them alone to do their work unless they request assistance or support	Believes teachers are a part of total faculty and establishes guidelines for all teachers for involvement with the change effort	Believes teachers are responsible for developing the best possible instruction and establishes expectations consistent with this view
	When requests for assistance or support are received, attempts to respond in a way that is satisfying to one who made the request	Monitors the progress of the change effort and attempts to anticipate needed assistance and resources	Anticipates the need for assistance and resources and provides support as needed (whether or not requested) and sometimes in advance of potential blockages
	Relies on teachers to report how things are going and to share any major problems	Maintains close contact with teachers and the change effort in an attempt to identify things that might be done to assist teachers with the change	Collects and uses information from a variety of sources to monitor the change effort and to plan interventions that will increase the probability of a successful, quality implementation
	Relies on whatever training is available with the innovation to develop teacher's knowledge and skills	In addition to the regularly provided assistance, seeks and uses sources within and outside the school to develop teacher knowledge and skills	Takes the lead in identifying when teachers have need for increased knowledge and skills and will see that it is provided, most likely using personnel and resources from within the building

Indicators of Change Facilitator Style

Dimensions/ Behaviors	*Responder*	*Manager*	*Initiator*
	Provides general support for teachers as persons and as professionals	Support is directed to individuals and subgroups for specific purposes related to the change as well as to provide for their personal welfare	Provides direct programmatic support through interventions targeted to individuals and the staff as a whole
	Tries to minimize the demands of the change effort on teachers	Modifies demands of the change effort to protect teachers from perceived overloads	Keeps ever present demands on teachers for effective implementation
Structuring their Leadership Role	Sees role as administrator	Sees role as avoiding or minimizing problems so instruction may occur	Sees role as one of ensuring school has strong instructional program and that teachers are teaching and students are learning
	Maintains low profile relative to day-to-day operation of school	Is very actively involved in day-to-day management	Directs the ongoing operation of school with emphasis on instruction through personal actions and clearly delegated responsibilities
	Identification and accomplishment of tasks are determined by the opinions and concerns presented	Is consistent in setting and accomplishing tasks and does much of it himself/herself	Identified and accomplished tasks are consistent with school priorities but responsibility may be delegated to others
	Maintains a general sense of "where the school is" and how teachers are feeling about things	Is well informed about what is happening in the school and who is doing what	Maintains specific knowledge of all that is going on in the school including classrooms through direct contact with individual teachers and students
	Responds to others in a manner intended to please them	Responds to others in a way that will be supportive of the operation of the school	Responds to others with concern but places student priorities above all else

From: Hall and Hord, 1984